LABORATORY SCHOOL FUNCTIONS AND TEACHER EDUCATION

By

CAREY THOMAS SOUTHALL, JR.

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
August, 1955

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THE AUTHOR GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGES HIS INDEBTEDNESS TO THOSE WHO HAVE ASSISTED IN THE CONDUCT OF THIS STUDY. HE IS PARTICULARLY INDEBTED TO DR. LEON HENDERSON, WHO WAS CHAIRMAN OF THE WRITER'S SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE AND ALSO HIS FRIEND AND COUNSELOR DURING HIS ENTIRE ATTENDANCE IN GRADUATE SCHOOL AT THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, FOR HIS INSPIRATION AND GUIDANCE THROUGHOUT THIS STUDY. APPRECIATION IS ALSO EXPRESSED TO DR. CHARLES L. DURRANCE, DR. HAL G. LEWIS, DR. JAMES L. WATTENBARGER, AND DR. WILLIAM E. BARINGER, FOR THEIR ASSISTANCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS STUDY.

THE WRITER IS GRATEFUL TO THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA FOR A GRADUATE ASSISTANTSHIP IN THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL WHICH MADE IT POSSIBLE TO CONDUCT THIS STUDY. THE ENCOURAGEMENT AND HELP OF PROFESSOR E. A. DAVIS, DIRECTOR OF THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL, MADE POSSIBLE THIS STUDY.

A WORD OF SPECIAL THANKS IS ALSO DUE THE MEMBERS OF THE STATISTICAL LABORATORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA FOR THEIR ASSISTANCE IN PREPARING THE DATA, AND TO DR. KENNETH KIDD, WHO HELPED DESIGN THIS STUDY. THE AID OF DR. S. GOULD SADLER AND MR. WAYLAND PHILLIPS IN ANALYZING THE DATA IS ALSO APPRECIATED.

A DEEP AND SINCERE APPRECIATIONIS GIVEN THE WRITER'S WIFE, LOLA JEAN, FOR HER CONSTANT ENCOURAGEMENT, INFINITE PATIENCE, AND ASSISTANCE THROUGHOUT THE STUDY. TO HIS DAUGHTER, CAROL ANN, APOLOGIES ARE EXPRESSED FOR THE MANY THINGS OF WHICH SHE WAS DEPRIVED DURING THE WRITING OF THIS STUDY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND ITS ACCOMPANYING LABORATORY EXPERIENCES HAVE LONG BEEN AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE AMERICAN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM. ONE OF THE DIFFICULTIES THAT HAS ALWAYS FACED THIS ARM OF TEACHER EDUCATION HAS BEEN THAT OF APPROPRIATE EMPHASIS ON OBSERVATION, PARTICIPATION, STUDENT TEACHING, AND EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH. THESE FOUR AREAS HAVE BEEN STRESSED BY MANY EDUCATIONAL WRITERS, PARTICULARLY IN RECENT YEARS, AS THE MAIN FUNCTIONS OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. A REVIEW OF RECENT PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE REVEALED THAT MANY LABORATORY SCHOOLS ARE PROVIDING ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING IN THE FORM OF SEMINARS AND ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS; FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY THESE EXPERIENCES WILL BE CONSIDERED AS A FUNCTION. SOME LABORATORY SCHOOLS ATTEMPT TO CARRY OUT THESE FIVE FUNCTIONS TO SOME DEGREE WHILE OTHERS TEND TO EMPHASIZE ONLY ONE OR MORE OF THESE FUNCTIONS.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

THERE IS A NEED FOR TRYING TO DETERMINE THE RELATIVE AMOUNT OF EMPHASIS THAT SHOULD BE PLACED ON THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS OF A LABORATORY SCHOOL IN A TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM TO DEVELOP SELECTED TEACHER COMPETENCIES. THIS NEED WAS RECOGNIZED BY CASWELL, WHO SAID, IN SPEAKING BEFORE A MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION IN 1951:

"There is a big job ahead in achieving appropriate emphasis on laboratory experiences in a program of teacher education."[1]

Lindsey was also cognizant of this problem when she, appearing before a combined group of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the Association for Student Teaching, asked:

"How effective are laboratory experiences relative to the kind of teachers needed in today's schools?"[2]

There is also a need to evaluate the functions of a particular laboratory school as they are related to the development of selected teacher competencies. Such information would have implications for the improved use of campus-connected schools in a teacher education program. It would also have implications for the improved use of the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School, of the University of Florida, the campus school selected for more detailed study.

Statement of the Problem

This study is concerned with a re-examination of the stated functions of campus-connected schools in a program of teacher education. More specifically, it has endeavored to answer the following questions:

1. How much are the functions of laboratory schools, affiliated with institutions which are members of the AACTE, being emphasized in actual practice to develop selected teacher competencies?

2. How much emphasis, as determined by a jury of leaders in

---

[1]H. L. Caswell, "The Professional Sequence in Teacher Education," Teachers College Record, March, 1951, p. 339.

[2]Margaret Lindsey, "Standard VI—Five Years Later," American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Seventh Yearbook, 1954, p. 132.

THE FIELD OF TEACHER EDUCATION, SHOULD BE PLACED ON THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS OF A CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOL TO DEVELOP SELECTED TEACHER COMPETENCIES?

3. How does the emphasis in the laboratory schools compare with that recommended by the educational leaders?

4. How does the emphasis given by P. K. Yonge Laboratory School compare with that given by the directors of other laboratory schools in the United States?

5. How does the emphasis given by P. K. Yonge Laboratory School compare with that recommended by the educational leaders?

6. Are there any identifiable factors that determine specified functions of a campus-connected school?

Limitations of the Study

This study emphasized a re-examination of the five stated functions of a campus-connected school as they were related to the development of selected competencies. Although it was assumed that in the campus school Research and Experimentation are more for the faculty to engage in than for the immediate development of prospective teachers in a teacher education institution, this function was studied with the four others in relation to competencies. Only the campus-connected schools of institutions that were members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education were studied. The case study involved only the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School.

Related Literature

It seems logical that there should be numerous studies

connected with an institution which has figured prominently and for such a long time in educational thought. Most of them fall loosely into three groups: (a) those investigations which have been specifically concerned with an analysis of student teaching, (b) those which have been directed toward an analysis of the administration of campus-connected schools, and (c) those which have had to do with a survey of opinions concerning the functions of a laboratory school.

An examination of these studies revealed that none included an investigation of the emphasis given in practice by laboratory schools relative to the development of selected teacher competencies. None revealed an evaluation by educational leaders as to how much emphasis should be placed on various functions; nor was there a case study of a particular laboratory school as it related to the emphasis of its functions concerned with the development of selected teacher competencies.

Sources of Data

Data used in this study came from:

1. Books, articles, pamphlets, public documents, reports and monographs which were related to this study.

2. Directors of campus-connected schools of colleges which are members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

3. A jury consisting of thirty-two educational leaders in the field of teacher education.

4. College of Education and P. K. Yonge Laboratory School records, files, staff, and faculty members.

Definition of Terms

Observation is that phase of the laboratory experiences of a prospective teacher in which, under direction, he studies procedures and techniques in teaching and managing a class, or it might be observing children per se. This function includes observation either by classes, groups from classes, or by individuals.

Participation is that phase of laboratory experiences in which the prospective teacher, under direction, has limited contact with pupils in a class but does not assume full responsibility as a teacher.

Student Teaching or Internship is that period of guided teaching when the student takes an increasing responsibility for the work with a group of learners, normally in a classroom, over a period of consecutive weeks.

Experiences Following Student Teaching are those experiences that might come in the form of seminars, more observations, follow-up studies, and participation in special projects or activities.

Research and Experimentation involve careful and unbiased investigation in which the scientific method is used, based insofar as possible upon demonstrable facts, refined distinctions, interpretations, and usually some generalizations.

Campus-connected school is one which is located on the grounds of a college or university and under its supervision and administration.

Teacher Education is the total educational program whereby a student is prepared to teach.

AACTE is the abbreviation for American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Method of Study

A review of professional literature regarding the functions of laboratory schools is reported by Bucklen[3] covering a synthesis of twenty-nine research studies appearing between the years 1945 and 1950. His analysis leads to further identification of the four main functions. They are Observation, Participation, Student Teaching, and Experimentation and Research.

He noted also that many of these schools are providing additional experiences after student teaching for prospective teachers. For the purposes of this study these experiences will be treated as a function since it is felt that they contribute to the development of teacher competencies.

Lists of teacher competencies were gathered and bibliographies of teacher competencies were reviewed. A final list of fifty-seven competencies were derived from the literature. A questionnaire was drawn up with these fifty-seven competencies under the five headings of Observation, Participation, Student Teaching, Experiences after Student Teaching, and Experimentation and Research.

Questionnaires were sent to the director of each laboratory

---

[3]Harry Bucklen, "Campus School: What Are Its Functions?", Journal of Teacher Education, September, 1952, pp. 201-203.

SCHOOL WITH MEMBERSHIP IN THE AACTE FOR AN EVALUATION OF THEIR FUNCTIONS. QUESTIONNAIRES WERE ALSO SENT TO SELECTED LEADERS IN THE FIELD OF TEACHER EDUCATION FOR THEIR JUDGMENT REGARDING FUNCTIONS OF A LABORATORY SCHOOL, AND TO EACH MEMBER OF THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL FACULTY FOR THEIR EVALUATION OF THE FUNCTIONS.

Overview of Chapters to Follow

CHAPTER II PRESENTS A HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND OF LABORATORY EXPERIENCES INCLUDING CURRENT TRENDS. FOR COMPARISON IT ALSO DESCRIBES THE ROLE OF LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN THE TRAINING OF PERSONS IN OTHER FIELDS.

CHAPTER III LISTS THE PRIMARY FUNCTION OF 100 CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS WITHIN THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND THE REASON WHY THEY HAVE THE PRIMARY FUNCTION THAT THEY DO. IT ALSO PRESENTS A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE EMPHASIS GIVEN BY THESE LABORATORY SCHOOLS TO THEIR FUNCTIONS IN RELATION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF SELECTED TEACHER COMPETENCIES.

CHAPTER IV PRESENTS THE DATA COMPILED FROM JURY JUDGMENT AS WELL AS THE LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS' RATINGS. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS BY FUNCTION AND BY SUBGROUPS OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES ARE ALSO SHOWN.

CHAPTER V IS A CASE STUDY OF THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND SHOWS A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND OTHER LABORATORY SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES AS WELL AS A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND THE JURORS' RATINGS.

CHAPTER VI PRESENTS THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS AND LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

A DISTINCTION COMMONLY MADE TODAY BETWEEN A PROFESSION AND A TRADE IS THAT A PROFESSION IS AN OCCUPATION REQUIRING SPECIAL KNOWLEDGE AND TRAINING IN SOME FIELD OF LEARNING WHILE A TRADE IS AN OCCUPATION INVOLVING MANUAL TRAINING AND SKILL. THESE SPECIALTIES FOR BOTH OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS ARE COMPLEMENTARY TO THE BACKGROUND OF GENERAL EDUCATION DESIRABLE FOR ALL CITIZENS LIVING IN A DEMOCRACY. THE LEARNED PROFESSIONS OVER THE CENTURIES HAVE TENDED TO REQUIRE THE MASTERY OF PATTERNS OF A PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE RELEVANT ARTS AND SCIENCES UNDER GUIDED SUPERVISION. THIS PRACTICE IS SIMILAR IN ORIGIN TO THE APPRENTICESHIP WHICH HISTORICALLY HAS BEEN ASSOCIATED WITH THE SKILLED TRADES, PRIMARILY IN CRAFTS.

THE LAWYER, DOCTOR, TEACHER, AND MINISTER DO NOT WAIT UNTIL COMPLETION OF THE LONG PERIOD OF FORMAL ACADEMIC PREPARATION BEFORE STARTING THESE GUIDED EXPERIENCES, OR THE PROFESSIONAL APPLICATION OF THE BODY OF KNOWLEDGE. PROSPECTIVE MINISTERS NOT ONLY PRESENT ORIGINAL SERMONS, BUT ALSO PARTICIPATE THROUGHOUT THEIR YEARS OF PREPARATION IN VARIOUS LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES OF THE CHURCH; PROSPECTIVE DOCTORS EARLY IN THEIR PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM OBSERVE AND ASSIST IN TEACHING HOSPITALS BEFORE GOING INTO THE MEDICAL INTERNSHIP, ONE OF THE LONGEST IN DURATION AMONG ALL PROFESSIONAL INTERNSHIPS; YOUNG LAWYERS OBSERVE IN COURTROOMS AND PARTICIPATE IN SIMULATED TRIALS;

AND, PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS VERY EARLY IN THE PROFESSIONAL CURRICULUM BEGIN TO WORK WITH CHILDREN AS LEARNERS AND WITH THE GROUP LIFE OF THE COMMUNITY INSOFAR AS THE MISSION OF THE SCHOOL IS INVOLVED WITH THE CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT.

THE CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOL IS THE SETTING FOR THE GUIDED EXPERIENCES OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS FROM THEIR EARLIEST PROFESSIONAL COURSES UNTIL COMPLETION OF FORMAL ACADEMIC PREPARATION. IT CORRESPONDS TO THE TEACHING HOSPITAL OF THE MEDICAL SCHOOL. SIMILARLY IT IS A RESEARCH LABORATORY FOR THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF OF THE SCHOOL AND THE COLLEGE.

PROVIDING FOR PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN THE PRE-SERVICE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS IS NOT A RECENT INNOVATION. FROM ITS EARLIEST BEGINNINGS, A DISTINCTIVE FEATURE OF TEACHER EDUCATION HAS BEEN THE USE OF AN ACTUAL SCHOOL FOR CHILDREN. NAMES GIVEN TO THESE SCHOOLS HAVE VARIED ACCORDING TO THEIR PURPOSES. IN THE EARLY DAYS OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN THIS COUNTRY THEY WERE NAMED "MODEL SCHOOLS." LATER SOME WERE DESIGNATED AS "PRACTICE SCHOOLS," THEN "TRAINING SCHOOLS," "DEMONSTRATION SCHOOLS," EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOLS," AND "CAMPUS SCHOOLS." MORE RECENTLY THE TERM "LABORATORY SCHOOL" HAS COME INTO MORE COMMON USAGE.[1]

EUROPEAN ORIGIN OF LABORATORY EXPERIENCES

ONE OF THE FIRST INDICATIONS OF THE RECOGNITION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION MAY BE

---

[1] ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING, "FUNCTIONS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS IN TEACHER EDUCATION" EIGHTH YEARBOOK (LOCK HAVEN, PENNSYLVANIA: THE ASSOCIATION, 1955), P. 1.

TRACED TO THE YEAR 1654 WHEN THE DUKE ERNEST OF GOTHA WROTE, "IT IS DESIRABLE THAT THE TEACHERS AT THEIR EXPENSE OR WITH ASSISTANCE REMAIN IN ONE CENTRAL PLACE AND... THROUGH PRACTICE LEARN THAT... FOR WHICH THEY WILL BE EMPLOYED IN THE FUTURE."[2] ANOTHER EARLY EXAMPLE OF THE RECOGNITION OF THE NEED FOR PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IS EVIDENCED BY THE FOUNDING IN BERLIN IN 1788 OF THE FIRST STATE SUPPORTED INSTITUTION FOR THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS. STUDENT TEACHING AND OTHER LABORATORY EXPERIENCES WERE PROVIDED. STUDENTS WERE GIVEN EXPERIENCES "THROUGH VISITATION AND OBSERVATION" OF THE REGULAR SCHOOL WORK, BY ASSISTING IN THE CLASS WORK OF THE REGULAR TEACHERS, BY OVERSIGHT AND CARE OF INDIFFERENT AND BACKWARD PUPILS, AND BY ACTUAL TEACHING ACCORDING TO INSTRUCTIONS AND UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE DIRECTOR.[3]

THE FIRST STATE NORMAL SCHOOL IN THE UNITED STATES WAS OPENED IN 1839 IN LEXINGTON, MASSACHUSETTS.[4] IMMEDIATELY AFTER IT WAS ESTABLISHED, A "MODEL SCHOOL" WAS ORGANIZED FOR PRACTICE-TEACHING. THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE NORMAL SCHOOL UTILIZED THE "MODEL SCHOOL" FOR OBSERVATION AND ACTUAL PRACTICE-TEACHING.

---

[2]E. I. F. WILLIAMS, THE ACTUAL AND POTENTIAL USE OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS (NEW YORK: BUREAU OF PUBLICATIONS, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, 1942), P. 1.

[3]IBID., P. 2.

[4]MASON STONE, "THE FIRST NORMAL SCHOOL IN AMERICA," TEACHERS COLLEGE RECORD, MAY, 1923, P. 267.

Early Use of the "Model School" in America

An outgrowth of the increase of normal schools was the American Normal School Association.[5] The following important resolution was adopted at their first annual convention in Trenton, New Jersey in 1859:

> Resolved: That the education of teachers should not only be theoretical, but also practical; and that, to this end, there should either be a school of observation and practice in immediate connection with the normal school, and under the same Board of Control, or that there should be in other ways equivalent opportunities for observation and practice.[6]

Normal schools continued to be established according to the needs of the various states. Even though the rate of expansion of normal schools was retarded by the Civil War, the number of laboratory schools increased gradually. Reports of the United States Commissioner of Education indicate that in 1874 forty-seven of the sixty-seven state normal schools had laboratory schools attached to them.[7]

The Stimulus of Accrediting Agencies

With the organization of the American Association of Teachers Colleges in 1917, successor to the American Normal School Association, there came a new emphasis on standards of teacher preparation. Although educators had long been aware of the value of professional laboratory experiences in pre-service education, certainly the accrediting function

---

[5]Charles A. Harper. A Century of Public Teacher Education (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Teachers Colleges, N.E.A., 1939), p. 65.

[6]Williams, op. cit., p. 65.

[7]Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for Year 1867-68, 1868, pp. 649-820.

OF THE ASSOCIATION HAS HAD CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOLS. IN 1926, THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS COLLEGES (SINCE 1948 KNOWN AS THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION) ADOPTED A STANDARD WHICH RECOMMENDED THAT:[8]

1. EACH TEACHERS COLLEGE MAINTAIN A TRAINING SCHOOL, OR EQUIVALENT FACILITIES.
2. EACH TEACHER IN THE TRAINING SCHOOL HAS RESPONSIBILITY FOR NOT MORE THAN FORTY CHILDREN AT ANY ONE TIME.
3. A MINIMUM PER STUDENT OF NINETY HOURS OF STUDENT-TEACHING BE REQUIRED.
4. FOR EVERY EIGHTEEN COLLEGE STUDENTS ENGAGED IN STUDENT-TEACHING THERE BE A MINIMUM GROUP OF THIRTY CHILDREN.
5. ONE FULL-TIME SUPERVISOR BE UTILIZED FOR EVERY FIFTY STUDENT-TEACHERS IN AFFILIATED SCHOOLS.
6. AT LEAST TWO-FIFTHS OF THE TEACHING IN THE TRAINING SCHOOL SHOULD BE DONE BY THE REGULAR STAFF OR COLLEGE FACULTY.

THIS MINIMUM QUANTITATIVE PRESCRIPTION FOR LABORATORY SCHOOLS CONTINUED IN EFFECT FOR OVER TWENTY YEARS. THEN IN 1946 A STUDY OF PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES WAS BEGUN BY THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND SURVEYS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS COLLEGES. ONE OF THE FIRST THINGS THIS COMMITTEE DID WAS TO COME UP WITH A DEFINITION OF A NEW TERM: "PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCE." THE MEANING OF THE TERM WAS OFFICIALLY DEFINED BY THE COMMITTEE AS:

> PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES INCLUDE ALL THOSE CONTACTS WITH CHILDREN, YOUTH AND ADULTS (THROUGH OBSERVATION, PARTICIPATION AND TEACHING) WHICH MAKE DIRECT CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNDERSTANDING

---

[8] AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS COLLEGE, "STANDARDS FOR ACCREDITING TEACHERS COLLEGES," YEARBOOK OF 1926 (ONEONTA, NEW YORK: THE ASSOCIATION, 1926), P. 11.

OF INDIVIDUALS AND THEIR GUIDANCE IN THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS.[9]

AFTER THE SUBCOMMITTEE HAD DEFINED THE TERM, A LEADERSHIP TRAINING CONFERENCE FOR THE AACTE WORKSHOP WAS HELD IN APRIL, 1950 AT ILLINOIS STATE NORMAL UNIVERSITY TO SPELL OUT THE CHARACTERISTICS OF A PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCE.[10] THEY WERE: (1) IT IS A GUIDED EXPERIENCE WHICH MAKES A DIRECT CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDENTS' UNDERSTANDING OF INDIVIDUALS AND COMPETENCE IN THEIR GUIDANCE AND TEACHING-LEARNING SITUATION; (2) IT REQUIRES THE STUDENTS' INVOLVMENT IN ACTIVE INTERACTION WITH CHILDREN, YOUTH OR ADULTS; (3) IT PROVIDES OPPORTUNITY FOR THE STUDENT, IN TERMS OF HIS READINESS, TO PARTICIPATE IN REPRESENTATIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE TEACHER.

IN ADDITION TO THE ABOVE CHARACTERISTICS THE WORKSHOP GROUP STATED THAT PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES SHOULD PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING: (1) AN OPPORTUNITY TO IMPLEMENT BASIC CONCEPTS AND IDEAS DISCUSSED IN COLLEGE CLASSES SO THAT THE STUDENT MAY STUDY THE PRAGMATIC VALUE AND THE THEORY AND CHECK HIS UNDERSTANDING OF THE THEORY IN ACTION; (2) HELP THE STUDENT IN SEEING HIS NEEDS (BOTH PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL) AND OUTLINING EXPERIENCES WHICH SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN HIS FURTHER STUDY; (3) AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE STUDENT TO STUDY HIS ABILITY TO GUIDE ACTUAL TEACHING-LEARNING SITUATIONS.

THE COMMITTEE DID NOT STOP WITH DEFINING THE TERM PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES WITH ITS CHARACTERISTICS AND FUNCTIONS. STARTING

---

[9] AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION, RECOMMENDED STANDARDS GOVERNING PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN STUDENT TEACHING AND EVALUATIVE CRITERIA (ONEONTA, NEW YORK: THE ASSOCIATION, 1949), P. 10.

[10] LEADERSHIP TRAINING CONFERENCE FOR THE AACTE WORKSHOP, ILLINOIS STATE NORMAL UNIVERSITY, APRIL, 1950.

WITH THE ASSIGNED TASK OF REVISING THE ASSOCIATION'S STANDARD VI, WHICH DEALT WITH "THE TRAINING SCHOOL AND STUDENT TEACHING" THE COMMITTEE STARTED STUDYING PROMISING TEACHER EDUCATION PRACTICES IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS. A REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE, SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN TEACHER EDUCATION, WAS PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION IN 1948. AFTER A STUDY BY MEMBER INSTITUTIONS, THE NEW STANDARD VI, ON "PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES" WAS ADOPTED BY THE ASSOCIATION IN FEBRUARY, 1949.[11]

ALTHOUGH THIS STANDARD WAS DEVELOPED AND ACCEPTED RATHER RECENTLY, IT HAS ALREADY HAD AND WILL LIKELY CONTINUE TO HAVE CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE ON THE CONTINUED USE AND EXPANSION OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM.

ONE EVIDENCE OF EFFORTS OF TEACHER-EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS TO IMPLEMENT THIS STANDARD IS TO BE FOUND IN THE REPORTS OF INSTITUTIONAL SELF-EVALUATION PROCEDURES CURRENTLY BEING ENCOURAGED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION. MARGARET LINDSEY REPORTED AT THE 1954 JOINT MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT TEACHING AND THE ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION ON A STUDY MADE OF SEVENTY-SIX INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION REPORTS. THIS STUDY CONCLUDED THAT STANDARD VI HAS GREATLY INFLUENCED THE THINKING AND BEHAVIOR OF TEACHER-EDUCATORS. IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE THE CONCLUSIONS RESULTING FROM THE LINDSEY STUDY WHICH SHOW CERTAIN TRENDS WITH REGARD TO PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN THE FIVE YEAR PERIOD

---

[11] AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS COLLEGES, SCHOOL AND LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN TEACHER EDUCATION (ONEONTA, NEW YORK: THE ASSOCIATION, 1948), P. 7.

OF 1948-1953. UNDOUBTEDLY THE PHILOSOPHY EXPRESSED IN STANDARD VI HAS HAD ITS INFLUENCE IN CAUSING THESE TRENDS:[12]

1. THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN PROVISION FOR PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES THROUGHOUT THE FOUR YEARS OF THE COLLEGE PROGRAM.

2. A GREATER NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS PROVIDE FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS TO OBSERVE AND PARTICIPATE IN THE TOTAL SCHOOL AND IN THE COMMUNITY.

3. PROVISION FOR DIRECT EXPERIENCES IS MADE CHIEFLY THROUGH WORK IN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY COURSES WITH VERY LIMITED OPPORTUNITIES IN SUBJECT MATTER COURSES.

4. IN GENERAL, STUDENTS ARE SPENDING MORE TIME IN STUDENT-TEACHING, BOTH BECAUSE OF INCREASED EMPHASIS ON FULL-TIME STUDENT-TEACHING AND BECAUSE OF THE INCREASE IN THE LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT TO STUDENT-TEACHING.

5. PROVISION FOR INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES OF STUDENTS IN STUDENT-TEACHING IS STILL LIMITED, THE CHIEF PROVISION BEING THROUGH ADJUSTMENTS IN THE NATURE OF ACTIVITIES.

6. THERE IS A MARKED INCREASE IN THE USE OF OFF-CAMPUS, COLLEGE COOPERATING SCHOOLS IN ALL PHASES OF THE SEQUENCES OF PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES.

7. THE EXTENT TO WHICH COMMUNITY AGENCIES ARE USED AS FACILITIES FOR LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IS FAR GREATER THAN INDICATED IN 1948.

8. STUDENTS ENGAGED IN PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES STILL GET THEIR GUIDANCE FROM LABORATORY SCHOOL TEACHERS AND COLLEGE TEACHERS OF EDUCATION WITH LITTLE PARTICIPATION IN THIS ACTIVITY BY SUBJECT-MATTER TEACHERS.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF ORGANIZED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS, LABORATORY SCHOOLS AND THEIR ACCOMPANYING LABORATORY EXPERIENCES HAVE HAD AN IMPORTANT PLACE IN THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS. THE PRELIMINARY PERIOD OF GUIDED TRAINING IN OTHER PROFESSIONS AND FIELDS OF TRAINING

---

[12] MARGARET LINDSEY, "STANDARD VI—FIVE YEARS AFTER," THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION. SEVENTH YEARBOOK (ONEONTA, NEW YORK: THE ASSOCIATION, 1954), P. 123.

CAN BE LIKENED SOMEWHAT TO THE PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS. THESE EXPERIENCES HAVE LONG PLAYED AN IMPORTANT PART FOR ANYONE WISHING TO QUALIFY FOR SERVICE IN A PROFESSION OR SKILLED TRADE. SOME OUTSTANDING EXAMPLES OF THIS WILL BE PRESENTLY DISCUSSED IN ORDER TO DEVELOP A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE PURPOSES AND PROCEDURES INVOLVED IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION.

Practical Experiences Plans of Other Professions

Apprenticeship.—This is essentially a combination of education and industry. It is a process of learning by doing, under which a person is taught the art of the trade by one who is engaged in it.[13] An apprentice is described as:

> One who is engaged in learning a trade under direct supervision according to a prescribed or traditional series of experiences graded to coincide with increasing maturity in learning a skilled occupation that requires a continuous period of experiences prior to the time that the worker may be considered qualified.[14]

The institution of apprenticeship has in fact been an important educational process since the beginning of history.[15] Down through the centuries apprenticeship has flourished in one form or another. It has its roots in antiquity and traces of it can be

---

[13]Paul H. Douglas, American Apprenticeship and Industrial Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1921), p. 11.

[14]U. S. Department of Labor, Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Part I (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor, 1949), p. 1.

[15]Paul Bergervin, Industrial Apprenticeship (New York: Mc-Graw-Hill Book Company, 1947), p. xiii.

found in the Babylonian Code of Hammurabi dating back to 2100 B.C.[16] Throughout the centuries education has passed through a number of phases of development and change, but very few historical institutions have been able to adapt themselves to modern times with as little change as has the apprenticeship. It continues important today despite other approaches in America's vast industrial system.[17]

Armed Forces.—Furthermore, the training received by members of the armed forces can be likened somewhat to that of a person in the crafts going from an apprentice to a journeyman. An examination of the job progression chart of each branch of service reveals that all personnel, upon entering the military service, are assigned to specific career fields. The Air Force has forty-two broad career fields;[18] the Navy has sixty-six broad career fields;[19] and the Army has thirty broad career fields.[20] Each of these is broken down into sub-career fields which is a specific job. The person on each job moves up the ladder of progressive skills under the direction and supervision of a skilled technician until he reaches a point of proficiency in that career field entailing a wide latitude of judgment, experience, and responsibility.

---

[16] Paul Douglas, op. cit., p. 13.

[17] Paul Bergervin, op. cit., p. 24.

[18] United States Air Force, Occupational Handbook of the United States Air Force (Washington, D. C.: Headquarters, United States Air Force, 1954), passim.

[19] United States Navy, Occupational Handbook of the United States Navy (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Naval Personnel, 1954), passim.

[20] United States Army, Occupational Handbook of the United States Army (Washington, D. C.: Office of the Adjutant General, 1954), passim.

Internship.—The internship may be regarded as a period in which a member of a learned profession receives practical experience under close supervision at or near the end of his formal training.

Medical Education.—The American medical school is now well along in the second century of its history. It began, and for many years continued to exist, as a supplement to the apprenticeship system still in vogue during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The likely youth of that period, destined to a medical career, was at an early age indentured to some reputable practitioner. Here his services were successively menial, pharmaceutical and professional, culminating in a practice of his own.[21]

The training of doctors has always been characterized by the medical student, during one phase or another, observing the practitioner demonstrating for the student. Medicine could not have won its place in the world today without the long, hard apprenticeship.[22] Since the establishment of the graded curriculum in a few university schools about fifty years ago, the overall design of the medical curriculum has changed but little. Medical education has assumed that the student would secure most of his practical instruction in the care of patients as an assistant to a practicing physician. This usually begins in the third year of medical school. This is the year that most medical schools assign the student to the study of patients on teaching

---

[21]Abraham Flexner, Medical Education in the United States and Canada (New York: A Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910), p. 1.

[22]Raymond B. Allen, Medical Education and the Changing Order (New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1948), p. 18.

wards. Here the student makes the rounds of the wards with practicing physicians and assists them under close supervision. The fourth year is similar to the third year but the program is designed to give the student more time with the patients.

This type of training is continued into the internship.[23] The internship is a period of hospital service, training and education, usually of one year's duration, which continues after graduation from medical school

The Commission on Graduate Medical Education published a report in 1940 in which it stated its views concerning the internship.[24]

> The internship should be an educational opportunity which rounds out the training received during the medical course and which continues the clinical clerkship with the enlarged responsibilities. It should, therefore, be considered as a basic preparation of the student for general practice; in addition, it should provide him with the foundation on which he can, by graduate training, develop proficiency in a specialty.

Legal Education.--The system of apprenticeship has been used to prepare men for all forms of industrial and professional work, not for manual arts alone. The avenue of entrance to all professions formerly lay through variations of the apprenticeship.[25] Much of the early legal training for the most part took the form of observation and reading in a lawyer's office. Apprenticeship training in law has not entirely disappeared even today, as is evidenced by the fact that

---

[23] John E. Deitrick and Robert C. Berson, Medical Schools in the United States (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953), p. 265.

[24] Graduate Medical Education. Report of the Commission on Graduate Medical Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940), p. 5.

[25] Herman Oliphant, "Parallels in the Development of Legal and Medical Education," American Academy of Political and Social Science, Annals, 167 (May, 1953), p. 156.

ADMISSION TO THE BAR AS REQUIRED BY MOST STATES IS STILL SO DRAWN AS TO ADMIT THE PERSON WHO HAS MERELY "READ" IN A LAWYER'S OFFICE. HOWEVER, THE MOST PREVALENT "LABORATORY EXPERIENCE" IN TODAY'S LAW SCHOOL COMES IN THE FORM OF THE STUDENT TAKING PRACTICE COURT AND PARTICIPATING IN MOCK TRIALS DURING HIS SENIOR YEAR.[26] THESE EXPERIENCES ARE SUPPLEMENTED BY THE OBSERVATION OF COURT PROCEDURES AND BY THE CASE STUDY TECHNIQUE. A LARGE NUMBER OF LAW GRADUATES AFFILIATE WITH LEGAL FIRMS, AND MAY PROGRESS TO JUNIOR PARTNER, EVENTUALLY TO SENIOR PARTNER.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION.—THE FIELD OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION HAS, FOR THE LAST TWENTY YEARS, OFFERED TO PROSPECTIVE CAREER MEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE AS INTERNS IN VARIOUS GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.

AT A CONFERENCE SPONSORED BY THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION CLEARING HOUSE IN JUNE 1953, AT PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY, THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION REGARDING INTERNSHIP WAS MADE:[27]

> THE INTERN IS DISTINCTLY A LEARNER. AS SUCH HE SHOULD BE GUIDED BY A PROFESSOR FROM THE INSTITUTION WHERE HE STUDIED OR IS STUDYING. THE INTERNSHIP SHOULD BE LOOKED UPON SOLELY AS AN INITIAL STEP IN WORKING TOWARD AN ADMINISTRATIVE CAREER. THE DEVICE OF THE INTERNSHIP IS THE PROCEDURE SUPPLEMENTING THE REGULAR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY WORK OR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION TO PERMIT STUDENTS TO COME INTO CLOSE CONTACT WITH PUBLIC OR QUASI-PUBLIC SERVICE. IT SHOULD OFFER THE PRIVILEGE OF WORK, STUDY AND OBSERVATION OF PUBLIC PROBLEMS OR GOVERNMENTAL TECHNIQUES UNDER PRACTICAL WORKING CONDITIONS WHERE THEORIES AND EXPERIENCE ARE BEING TESTED AND ACTUAL POLICIES ARE BEING ADMINISTERED.

SUMMARY

THE NECESSITY FOR A PRELIMINARY PERIOD OF GUIDED TRAINING

---

[26] SIDNEY P. SIMPSON, "THE FUNCTION OF THE UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL," HARVARD LAW REVIEW, MAY, 1946, P. 1068.

[27] M. B. LAMBIE (EDITOR), TRAINIGN FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE (CHICAGO: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SERVICE, 1945), P. 25.

IN THE PREPARATION OF ANYONE WISHING TO QUALIFY FOR SERVICE IN A PROFESSION OR SKILLED TRADE HAS BEEN POINTED OUT. IT'S HISTORICAL BACKGROUND SHOWS THAT IT HAS LONG BEEN ACCEPTED AS AN EFFECTIVE WAY OF LEARNING.

ALTHOUGH VARIED FORMS OF THE APPRENTICESHIP ORIGINALLY SERVED BOTH LEARNED PROFESSIONS AND THE CRAFT TRADES, THERE IS A CENTURIES OLD TREND, NOW RAPIDLY ACCELERATED, FOR THE LEARNED PROFESSION TO EMPLOY LABORATORY TYPE EXPERIENCES CULMINATING IN THE INTERNSHIP. FOR EXAMPLE, SINCE THE FLEXNER REPORT,[28] IN 1910, MEDICAL EDUCATION HAS BEEN STRENGTHENED BY STRICT REQUIREMENTS OF PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE BOTH PRIOR TO AND DURING THE INTERNSHIP.

FOR MORE THAN 100 YEARS AMERICAN TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS HAVE USED CAMPUS SCHOOLS AS A REGULAR FACILITY. HOWEVER, IT WAS NOT UNTIL 1926 THAT THE TEACHER EDUCATORS' PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS BEGAN TIGHTENING UP ON THE NATURE AND QUALITY OF THE GUIDED PRACTICAL EXPERIENCES OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS. THIS IS IN LINE WITH IMPROVEMENTS THAT ARE BEING SOUGHT IN THE VARIOUS FIELDS OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION. STANDARD VI HAS BEEN CLARIFIED AS THE RESULT OF COMMITTEE AND WORKSHOP STUDIES AS WELL AS COOPERATIVE EVALUATIONS MADE BY MEMBER INSTITUTIONS OF THE AACTE. THE MAIN QUESTION FACING TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS TODAY IS HOW CAN THESE PRACTICAL EXPERIENCES CONTRIBUTE MORE AND MORE EFFECTIVELY TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF THOSE COMPETENCIES REQUIRED OF TEACHERS WHO ARE ABOUT TO BE GIVEN OFFICIAL STATE CERTIFICATION FOR TEACHING IN THE SCHOOLS?

---

[28] FLEXNER, OP. CIT., P. 1.

CHAPTER III

THE FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS OF HIGHER INSTITUTIONS ACCREDITED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

One of the purposes of this study was to determine to what degree the laboratory schools of higher institutions accredited by the AACTE are emphasizing their functions to develop teacher competencies.

Method of Study and Treatment of Data

Lists of teacher competencies were gathered and bibliographies of teacher competencies were reviewed. Two of the latest lists of teacher competencies examined were the "Measure of a Good Teacher" published by the California Teachers Association in 1952 and "Factors in Teaching Competence" published in 1954 by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association. These two lists have had wide circulation and study by the profession throughout the nation and represent recent thought regarding teacher competencies. As the result of analysis and refinement of these two lists fifty-seven teacher competencies were derived. They were categorized into six groups as follows:

1. As a Director of Learning
2. As a Counselor and Guidance Worker
3. As a Mediator of the Culture
4. As a Member of the School Community

5. As a Liaison between School and Community

6. As a Member of the Profession

A list of all laboratory schools within the AACTE was secured from the Executive Secretary of the AACTE. There are 166 such schools in the United States. The director of each of these schools was sent a questionnaire with the fifty-seven competencies, each under the heading of the five functions, namely; Observation, Participation, Student Teaching, Experiences after Student Teaching, and Experimentation and Research. He was asked to rate the degree of emphasis his school was giving each function, relative to the development of the selected list of teacher competencies, by placing a numerical rating at a designated point opposite each competency under each function. In addition to rating those functions numerically, each laboratory school director was asked to indicate which of those five functions he considered the primary one of his school and to list the reasons why.

The following rating scale was used:

0—Is not used or emphasized at all

1—Is used or emphasized to a small degree

2—Is used or emphasized to some degree

3—Is used or emphasized to a high degree

4—Is used or emphasized to a very high degree

The following plan was used in the interpretation of the mean value for each teacher competency under each function as rated by the laboratory school directors:

Mean	Midpoint	Interpretation
3.5 - 4.4	4	Is used to a very high degree
2.5 - 3.4	3	Is used to a high degree
1.5 - 2.4	2	Is used to some degree
.4 - 1.4	1	Is used to a small degree
-0.0 - 0.4	0	Is not used at all

The mean and standard deviation were calculated for each competency under each function and are found in Exhibit F in the Appendix.

The mean was used as a measure of central tendency in this study because it was felt that the influence of all ratings was desired. Larson and Yocum[1] state "...if the influence of all scores is desired the mean should then be used." Sorenson[2] makes the following statement concerning the use of the mean: "The mean offers a convenient and generally valid basis for comparison." The main purposes of this study were to determine relationships between the various aspects of the study. Since the mean is a valid basis for comparison it is used as the measure of central tendency in this study. Then, for calculating the coefficient of correlations the product moment method was used.

It has been admitted that a five point rating scale may not give results as refined as a larger scale. However, McCloy[3] makes

---

[1]Leonard A. Larson and Rachel D. Yocum, Measurement and Evaluation in Physical Health and Recreation Education (St. Louis: The C.V. Mosby Co., 1951), p. 303.

[2]Herbert Sorenson, Statistics for Students of Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1936), p. 58.

[3]Charles H. McCloy, Tests and Measurements in Health and Physical Education (New York: F. S. Crofts and Co., 1942), p. 205.

THE FOLLOWING OBSERVATION REGARDING RATING SCLAES:

> USUALLY FIVE GROUPS ARE USED. IN SOME INSTANCES IT HAS BEEN FOUND THAT RATERS ARE RELUCTANT TO USE THE TWO EXTREME CATEGORIES CAUSING THE FIVE-CATEGORY SCALE TO BECOME PRACTICALLY A THREE-CATEGORY SCALE.

QUESTIONNAIRES WERE RECEIVED FROM 115 LABORATORY SCHOOLS WHICH REPRESENTS 69.2 PER CENT OF ALL THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS WITHIN THE AACTE.[4] ONE HUNDRED OF THESE, OR 60.2 PER CENT, WERE RECEIVED IN TIME TO BE TABULATED AND CALCULATIONS MADE AS FOUND IN EXHIBIT F IN THE APPENDIX. HOWEVER, ALL 115 WERE USED IN LISTING THE FACTORS IN TABLE 2.

DIRECTORS' RATINGS

TABLE 1 GIVES THE CLASSIFICATION OF PRIMARY FUNCTIONS OF 115 LABORATORY SCHOOLS WITHIN THE AACTE. IT SHOULD BE POINTED OUT THAT OBSERVATION AND PARTICIPATION ARE SEPARATE FUNCTIONS BUT THAT SIXTEEN LABORATORY SCHOOLS COMBINED THEM AND INDICATED THAT THE TWO TOGETHER WERE CONSIDERED AS A PRIMARY FUNCTION. FIFTY-FIVE PER CENT OF THE DIRECTORS LISTED STUDENT TEACHING, 20 PER CENT OBSERVATION, 14 PER CENT OBSERVATION AND PARTICIPATION, 7 PER CENT PARTICIPATION, AND 2.6 PER CENT EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH AS PRIMARY FUNCTIONS. NONE LISTED EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING.

TABLE 2 CATEGORIZES THE REASONS GIVEN BY 115 LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS AS TO WHY THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS RECEIVE PRIMARY EMPHASIS AT THEIR RESPECTIVE SCHOOLS. THIS INFORMATION WAS DERIVED FROM STATEMENTS CITED IN EXHIBIT E IN THE APPENDIX.

---

[4] A LIST OF THESE SCHOOLS COOPERATING IN THIS STUDY MAY BE FOUND IN EXHIBIT C IN THE APPENDIX.

TABLE 1

CLASSIFICATION OF PRIMARY FUNCTIONS OF 115 LABORATORY SCHOOLS WITHIN THE AACTE

Function	Number	Per cent
Student Teaching	64	55.6
Observation	23	20.0
Observation and Participation	16	14.0
Participation	9	7.8
Experimentation and Research	3	2.6
Experiences after Student Teaching	0	0.0

An analysis of the information found in Table 2 and a closer scrutiny of Exhibit E in the Appendix reveals the following:

1. The number of laboratory schools providing Student Teaching as a primary function is apparently decreasing.
2. One of the main determining factors as to why certain of the laboratory schools still have Student Teaching is due to the continued availability of an adequate plant and appropriate facilities.
3. These data seem to indicate that more laboratory schools would continue to have Student Teaching if an adequate plant and appropriate facilities were available.
4. That programs of Observation and Participation are expanding in campus schools.

Table 3 lists the mean rating and standard deviation for each group of teacher competencies under each function as rated by 100 laboratory school directors. This information was derived from data cited in Exhibit F in the Appendix.

TABLE 2

STATED REASONS OF 115 CAMPUS SCHOOL DIRECTORS FOR PRIMARY EMPHASIS OF THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS

Reasons	Frequency
Student Teaching (55.6 per cent)	
1. Philosophy	29
2. Adequate plant and appropriate facilities for student-teaching	11
3. Professional qualifications of directing teachers	6
4. Original intent	2
5. Evaluation of pre-service program	2
6. Limited off-campus facilities	2
Observation (20 per cent)	
1. Limited opportunities for student teachers	11
2. Philosophy	10
3. Adequate plant and appropriate facilities for observation	5
4. Tradition	2
5. Easily integrated with professional program	2
Observation and Participation (14 per cent)	
1. Philosophy	8
2. Limited opportunities for student teachers	4
3. Professional qualification of directing teacher	2
4. Adequate plant and appropriate facilities for observation and participation	2
5. Pre-induction into student teaching	2
Participation (7.8 per cent)	
1. Limited opportunities for student teachers	6
2. Philosophy	3
3. Evaluation of student program prior to student teaching	3
4. Pre-induction into student teaching	2
Experimentation and Research (2.6 per cent)	
1. Adequate plant and appropriate facilities for experimentation and research	4
2. Philosophy	2
3. Providing leadership for public schools	2

TABLE 3

THE MEAN RATING AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR EACH GROUP OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES AS RATED BY 100 LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS

Groups of Teacher Competencies	Function	Mean Rating and Standard Deviation of Degree to which Competencies are being developed by:	
		M.	S.D.
	Observation		
1.	As a Director of Learning	2.3	.4
2.	As a Mediator of the Culture	2.0	.2
3.	As a Member of the Profession	1.8	.2
4.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	1.6	.3
5.	As a Member of the School Community	1.4	.2
6.	As a Liaison between School and Community	1.2	.2
	Participation		
1.	As a Director of Learning	2.5	.3
2.	As a Mediator of the Culture	2.2	.3
3.	As a member of the Profession	1.9	.2
4.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	1.9	.4
5.	As a Member of the School Community	1.6	.2
6.	As a Liaison between School and Community	1.4	.2
	Student Teaching		
1.	As a Director of Learning	3.4	.2
2.	As a Mediator of the Culture	3.1	.3
3.	As a Member of the Profession	2.8	.3
4.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	2.8	.4
5.	As a Member of the School Community	2.6	.2
6.	As a Liaison between School and Community	2.4	.3
	Experiences after Student Teaching		
1.	As a Member of the Profession	1.5	.1
2.	As a Mediator of the Culture	1.2	.1
3.	As a Director of Learning	1.2	.1
4.	As a Member of the School Community	1.1	.1
5.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	1.0	.1
6.	As a Liaison between School and Community	1.0	.1

TABLE 3—CONTINUED

GROUPS OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES	FUNCTION	MEAN RATING AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF DEGREE TO WHICH COMPETENCIES ARE BEING DEVELOPED BY:	
		M.	S.D.
	EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH		
1.	AS A MEMBER OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY	.82	.1
2.	AS A MEMBER OF THE PROFESSION	.81	.1
3.	AS A MEDIATOR OF THE CULTURE	.81	.1
4.	AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING	.79	.1
5.	AS A COUNSELOR AND GUIDANCE WORKER	.69	.1
6.	AS A LIAISON BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY	.65	.1

AN EXAMINATION OF TABLE 3 REVEALS THAT:

1. EACH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES HAS THE SAME RELATIVE POSITION UNDER OBSERVATION, PARTICIPATION, AND STUDENT TEACHING: AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING, AS A MEDIATOR OF THE CULTURE, AS A MEMBER OF THE PROFESSION, AS A COUNSELOR AND GUIDANCE WORKER, AS A MEMBER OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY AND AS A LIAISON BETWEEN THE SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY.
2. THE DEGREE TO WHICH EACH GROUP OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES IS BEING DEVELOPED GOES PROGRESSIVELY UPWARD WITH THESE SAME THREE FUNCTIONS, BEGINNING WITH OBSERVATION, FOLLOWED BY PARTICIPATION AND STUDENT TEACHING.
3. TEACHER COMPETENCIES ARE BEING DEVELOPED TO A SMALL DEGREE THROUGH EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING AND TO AN EVEN LESS DEGREE THROUGH EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH.
4. THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE STANDARD DEVIATIONS

among the groups of competencies under the function of Observation, Participation, and Student Teaching; however, the standard deviations are smaller for the groups of competencies under the functions of Experiences after Student Teaching and Experimentation and Research.

Summary

Teacher competencies are being developed to the highest degree by Student Teaching, followed by Participation and Observation, by 100 laboratory schools in the United States. Experiences after Student Teaching and Experimentation and Research do not play a very important role in the development of teacher competencies.

Some laboratory schools still have adequate plant and appropriate facilities for carrying out the function of Student Teaching. From the data presented it may be surmised that many laboratory schools would continue Student Teaching if an adequate plant and appropriate facilities were available for the three big functions of Observation, Participation, and Student Teaching. Without a doubt, guided experiences of observation and participation are no longer limited to the period of student teaching or the internship, but are also regarded as essential aspects of the teacher education sequence prior to student teaching.

CHAPTER IV

A COMPARISON OF THE JUDGMENTS OF SELECTED LEADERS IN TEACHER EDUCATION WITH PRACTICES OF 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS OF INSTITUTIONS ACCREDITED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

ONE OF THE PURPOSES OF THIS STUDY WAS TO DETERMINE WHAT EMPHASIS, AS DETERMINED BY A JURY OF LEADERS IN THE FIELD OF TEACHER EDUCATION, SHOULD BE PLACED ON THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS OF A LABORATORY SCHOOL RELATIVE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF SELECTED TEACHER COMPETENCIES. ANOTHER PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY WAS TO COMPARE THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN THESE FUNCTIONS IN ACTUAL PRACTICE TO DEVELOP THOSE TEACHER COMPETENCIES WITH THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS THAT THE JURY RECOMMENDED SHOULD BE GIVEN.

METHOD OF STUDY AND TREATMENT OF DATA

THE JURORS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THIS STUDY WERE SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

1. EDUCATION.
   (A) DOCTOR'S DEGREE, OR
   (B) MASTER'S DEGREE, IF FACTORS OF LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE SEEMED SIGNIFICANT.
2. AT LEAST FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN POSITIONS OF LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITY IN TEACHER EDUCATION.
3. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE LITERATURE IN THE FIELD OF TEACHER EDUCATION.
4. LETTERS WERE SENT TO RECENT PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE AMERICAN

Association for Student Teaching, and the Executive Secretary of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. They were asked to make nominations for prospective jurors using the above criteria as a guide. After a list of prospective jurors had been secured it was carefully checked with the Education Index, Leaders in Education, and Who's Who in American Education to verify their qualifications.

A list of prospective jurors was drawn up and letters were sent to these leaders asking for their cooperation as members of a jury for rating the functions of campus-connected schools for this study. Eighty per cent of them accepted the invitation to participate.[1]

The questionnaire that was submitted to the jurors was identical with the one submitted to the directors of each laboratory school except that the verb form used in the rating scale was slightly different. It was as follows:

0—Should not be used or emphasized at all

1—Should be used or emphasized to a small degree

2—Should be used or emphasized to some degree

3—Should be used or emphasized to a high degree

4—Should be used or emphasized to a very high degree

The following plan was used in the interpretation of the mean value for each teacher competency under each function as rated by a jury of educational leaders in the field of teacher education:

---

[1] A list of these jurors may be found in Exhibit D in the Appendix.

Mean	Midpoint	Interpretation
3.5 - 4.4	4	Should be used to very high degree
2.5 - 3.4	3	Should be used to high degree
1.5 - 2.4	2	Should be used to some degree
.5 - 1.4	1	Should be used to a small degree
-0.0 - 0.4	0	Should not be used at all

The mean rating and standard deviation were calculated for each teacher competency under each function. A product moment correlation was calculated to indicate the relationship between the ratings of 100 laboratory school directors and the ratings of the jurors for each of the six groups of competencies and are found in Exhibit F.

Coefficients of correlations were also calculated for the total fifty-seven competencies which make up the six groups under each function. Levels of confidence were used to determine the significance of the obtained r in each case.[2] In the interpretation of confidence levels, the 5 per cent level indicates that 95 times out of 100 the obtained r would be correct and the other 5 times might be due to chance. The 1 per cent level indicates the obtained r would be correct 99 times out of 100 and the other one time might be due to chance. The Wallace-Snedecor Tables[3] give the values of r which would be needed to meet the requirements of significance at the 1 and 5 per cent levels of confidence.

---

[2] M. J. Hagood and D. O Price, Statistics for Sociologists (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1952), p. 228.

[3] J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1950), p. 609.

Comparison of Judgments

Table 4 shows the degree to which the six groups of teacher competencies are being developed under the five functions of 100 laboratory schools and the degree to which they should be developed as recommended by a jury of selected leaders in teacher education.

A comparison of ratings for each group in Table 4 shows that the degree to which the six groups of teacher competencies are being developed is less in every case than the degree to which they should be developed, according to the opinions of the experts. The largest difference in ratings between the jurors and laboratory school directors is found in the groups of competencies under the function of Experiences after Student Teaching followed by those under Experimentation and Research.

Table 5 shows the relationship between the jurors' ratings and the ratings of 100 laboratory school directors for each of the six groups of teacher competencies under each function.

Comparison of Ratings Between 100 Laboratory School Directors and the Jury

A comparison of the ratings of 100 laboratory school directors and the ratings of jurors showed several obtained r's under each function which were significant at either the 1 per cent level of confidence or the 5 per cent level of confidence.

Observation.—Under this function there are three groups that have obtained r's that are significant at the 1 per cent level. They are As a Director of Learning with an r of .97. The r's obtained for the remaining three groups do not meet the requirements of significance

TABLE 4

THE MEAN RATING AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE SIX GROUPS OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES AS RATED BY 100 LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS AND A JURY OF SELECTED LEADERS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Groups of Teacher Competencies	Function	100 Laboratory Schools		Jury	
		M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
	Observation				
1.	As a Director of Learning	2.3	.4	2.6	.3
2.	As a Mediator of the Culture	2.0	.2	2.2	.1
3.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	1.8	.2	2.1	.3
4.	As a Member of the Profession	1.6	.3	2.1	.4
5.	As a Member of the School Community	1.4	.2	1.9	.2
6.	As a Liaison between School and Community	1.2	.2	1.8	.2
	Participation				
1.	As a Director of Learning	2.5	.3	3.0	.3
2.	As a Mediator of the Culture	2.2	.3	2.7	.3
3.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	1.9	.4	2.6	.4
4.	As a Member of the Profession	1.9	.2	2.5	.2
5.	As a Member of the School Community	1.6	.2	2.3	.3
6.	As a Liaison between School and Community	1.4	.2	2.0	.2
	Student Teaching				
1.	As a Director of Learning	3.4	.2	3.3	.2
2.	As a Mediator of the Culture	3.1	.3	3.3	.2
3.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	2.8	.4	3.0	.3
4.	As a Member of the Profession	2.8	.3	2.9	.3
5.	As a Member of the School Community	2.6	.2	2.8	.2
6.	As a Liaison between School and Community	2.4	.3	2.4	.4
	Experiences after Student Teaching				
1.	As a Member of the Profession	1.5	.1	3.2	.2
2.	As a Mediator of the Culture	1.2	.1	3.0	.1
3.	As a Member of the School Community	1.2	.1	2.8	.4
4.	As a Director of Learning	1.2	.1	2.6	.2
5.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	1.0	.1	2.7	.2
6.	As a Liaison between School and Community	1.0	.1	2.7	.2

TABLE 4—CONTINUED

GROUPS OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES	FUNCTION	100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS		JURY	
		M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
	EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH				
1. As a Director of Learning		.8	.1	2.0	.3
2. As a Mediator of the Culture		.8	.1	2.1	.1
3. As a Member of the School Community		.8	.1	1.9	.4
4. As a Member of the Profession		.8	.1	1.6	.3
5. As a Counselor and Guidance Worker		.7	.1	1.9	.3
6. As a Liaison between School and Community		.7	.1	1.8	.1

AT EITHER LEVEL AND THEREFORE ARE REJECTED. THEY ARE AS A MEDIATOR OF THE CULTURE WITH AN R OF −.09; AS A MEMBER OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY WITH AN R OF .59; AND AS A LIAISON BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY WITH AN R OF .69.

PARTICIPATION.—THERE ARE TWO GROUPS UNDER THIS FUNCTION THAT HAVE OBTAINED R'S THAT ARE SIGNIFICANT AT THE 1 PER CENT LEVEL. THEY ARE AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING WITH AN R OF .85 AND AS A COUNSELOR AND GUIDANCE WORKER WITH AN R OF .95. THE OBTAINED R'S FOR THE FOLLOWING GROUPS ARE SIGNIFICANT AT THE 5 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE: AS A LIAISON BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY WITH AN R OF .95 AND AS A MEMBER OF THE PROFESSION WITH AN R OF .86. THE OBTAINED R'S FOR THE TWO REMAINING GROUPS MAY BE REJECTED AS THEY DO NOT MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF SIGNIFICANCE AT EITHER LEVEL. THEY ARE AS A MEDIATOR OF THE CULTURE WITH AN R OF .61 AND AS A MEMBER OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY WITH AN R OF .69.

STUDENT TEACHING.—THERE ARE THREE OBTAINED R'S UNDER THIS FUNCTION THAT ARE SIGNIFICANT AT THE 1 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE

TABLE 5

DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP, AS EXPRESSED BY COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION, EXISTING BETWEEN THE JURORS' RATINGS AND THE RATINGS OF 100 LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS FOR EACH OF THE SIX GROUPS OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES UNDER EACH FUNCTION

Groups of Teacher Competencies	Function	Coefficient of Correlation
	Observation	
1.	As a Director of Learning	.83*
2.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	.88*
3.	As a Mediator of the Culture	-.09
4.	As a Member of the School Community	.59
5.	As a Liaison between School and Community	.69
6.	As a Member of the Profession	.97
	Participation	
1.	As a Director of Learning	.85*
2.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	.95*
3.	As a Mediator of the Culture	.61
4.	As a Member of the School Community	.69
5.	As a Liaison between School and Community	.95**
6.	As a Member of the Profession	.86**
	Student Teaching	
1.	As a Director of Learning	.66*
2.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	.97*
3.	As a Mediator of the Culture	-.46
4.	As a Member of the School Community	.51
5.	As a Liaison between School and Community	.99*
6.	As a Member of Profession	.77
	Experiences after Student Teaching	
1.	As a Director of Learning	.01
2.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	.76**
3.	As a Mediator of the Culture	.37
4.	As a Member of the School Community	.88**
5.	As a Liaison between School and Community	.02
6.	As a Member of the Profession	.68

TABLE 5—CONTINUED

Groups of Teacher Competencies	Function	Coefficient of Correlation
	Experimentation and Research	
1.	As a Director of Learning	.60*
2.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	.69**
3.	As a Mediator of the Culture	.74
4.	As a Member of the School Community	.74
5.	As a Liaison between School and Community	-.43
6.	As a Member of the Profession	.86**

**Significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence.

*Significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence.

They are As a Director of Learning with an r of .66; As a Counselor and Guidance Worker with an r of .97; and As a Liaison Between School and Community with an r of .99. The obtained r's for the three remaining groups were not significant at either level and therefore may be rejected. These groups are As a Mediator of the Culture with an r of -.45; As a Member of the School Community with an r of .51; and As a Member of the Profession with an r of .77.

Experiences after Student Teaching.—Under this function there are only two obtained r's that are significant at either level of confidence and they were significant at the 5 per cent level. They are As a Counselor and Guidance Worker with an r of .76 and As a Member of the School Community with an r of .88. The remaining four groups have obtained r's that are too low to meet the requirements at either level. They are As a Director of Learning with an r of .01; As a Mediator of the Culture with an r of .37; As a Liaison between School and Community with an r of .02; and As a Member of the Profession with an r of .68.

Experimentation and Research.—The obtained R of .60 for the group, As a Director of Learning, is the only significant R at the 1 per cent level of confidence. There are two groups that have obtained R^2s that are significant at the 5 per cent level. They are As a Member of the Profession with an R of .86 and As a Counselor and Guidance Worker with an R of .69. The three remaining groups have obtained R^2s that are too low to meet the requirements at either level. They are as a Mediator of the Culture with an R of .74; As a Member of the School Community with an R of .74; and As a Liaison between School and Community with an R of −.43.

Coefficients of correlation were also calculated for the total fifty-seven competencies which make up the six groups under each function. The obtained R for each of the five functions was significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence. These relationships are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6

DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP, AS EXPRESSED BY COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION, EXISTING BETWEEN THE JURORS' RATINGS AND RATINGS OF 100 LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS FOR EACH OF THE FIVE FUNCTIONS

Function	Coefficient of Correlation
Participation	.91
Observation	.81
Student Teaching	.66
Experimentation and Research	.61
Experiences after Student Teaching	.45

Summary

This chapter has shown that the degree to which teacher competencies are being developed by the five functions of 100 laboratory schools is less than the degree to which these competencies should be developed by those functions according to the opinions of the experts. It was shown that teacher competencies should be developed to the highest degree through Student Teaching, followed by Experiences after Student Teaching, Participation, Observation, and Experimentation and Research.

The closest relationship between the jurors' ratings and the ratings of 100 laboratory school directors was in Participation with an R of .91 followed by Observation with an R of .81; Student Teaching with an R of .66; Experimentation and Research with an R of .61; and Experiences after Student Teaching with an R of .45.

CHAPTER V

A CASE STUDY OF THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL

One campus school was selected for more detailed study in order to seek answers for two principal questions, namely:

1. How does the emphasis placed on the five functions by the faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School compare with that recommended by a jury of educational leaders?

2. How does the emphasis placed on the five functions by the faculty of the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School compare with that given by the directors of other laboratory schools in the United States?

Background

The P. K. Yonge Laboratory School is on the campus of the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida. The plant housing this school was occupied for the first time in 1934. It was constructed at a total cost of approximately $400,000, including a grant from the General Education Board of $150,000.[1] In addition to housing the campus laboratory school, the building also houses the College of Education. All of the offices of the sixty-five members of the faculty of the College of Education are located in the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School buildings.[2]

---

[1] A. R. Mead and J. T. Campbell. The P. K. Yonge Laboratory School Building, College of Education, University of Florida, March, 1947.

[2] It should be noted here that the Legislature of the State of Florida at its biennial session in 1955 approved the financing of a new plant for the Laboratory School. The College of Education will remain in the old building.

The P. K. Yonge Laboratory School contains the grades from kindergarten through the twelfth year inclusive. The teaching staff is composed of the director and thirty teachers. The present director holds the college rank of assistant professor and has the status of head of a department. If the director has the doctoral degree he may advance to the rank of full professor. One faculty member holds the Doctor of Education degree. All the others have the master's degree.

Organization

In order to explain the organizational structure of the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School, it is necessary to present the overall organizational scheme for the College of Education. The present administrative and organizational plan was adopted by the faculty of the College of Education, including the laboratory school faculty, and was implemented July 1, 1949.[3]

It is considered to be unique in organization. The faculty first adopted certain criteria and principles upon which to predicate the organization of the College of Education. These were adapted from the Southern States Work Conference Bulletin No. 1,[4] and are quoted as adopted by the College of Education faculty on April 5, 1949:

---

[3]A new organizational plan for the College of Education was adopted by the faculty in June 1955. The organization described herein was in effect at the time of the writing of this manuscript.

[4]State Responsibility for the Organization and Administration of Education, Bulletin No. 1, Southern States Work Conference on School Administrative Problems, 1942.

1. DEMOCRACY: THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION SHOULD DIGNIFY THE INDIVIDUAL, DEVELP HIS INITIATIVE, AND SECURE HIS VOLUNTARY INTELLIGENT COOPERATION. THIS CRITERION IS SO SELF-EVIDENT THAT ITS JUSTIFICATION IS NOT NECESSARY. HOWEVER, TOO MUCH EMPHASIS UPON ORGANIZATION AS SUCH MAY THWART THE ATTAINMENT OF THIS OBJECTIVE. DEFINITE LINE AND STAFF RELATIONSHIPS MUST BE ESTABLISHED IN THE ORGANIZATION IN ORDER TO PROMOTE EFFICIENT FUNCTIONING BUT THE BASIC PHILOSOPHY OF THOSE CHARGED WITH THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ORGANIZATION MUST BE DEMOCRATIC IN NATURE. INDIVIDUALS SHOULD NOT BE TREATED AS COGS IN A MACHINE BUT RATHER AS IMPORTANT AND VITAL MEMBERS OF THE ORGANIZATION. EACH STAFF MEMBER SHOULD BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO RENDER SERVICES IN ACCORDANCE WITH HIS CAPACITY AND TRAINING, HE SHOULD BE GIVEN AUTHORITY COMMENSURATE WITH HIS RESPONSIBILITIES, AND HE SHOULD BE GIVEN DUE CREDIT FOR HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS. THE ORGANIZATION SCHEME SHOULD MAKE IT POSSIBLE FOR IDEAS AND SUGGESTIONS FROM THE LOWEST LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY TO REACH THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY WITHOUT THE NECESSITY OF CLEARANCE THROUGH ALL THE ECHELONS OF RESPONSIBILITY.

2. SIMPLICITY: THERE SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF ORGANIZATIONAL MACHINERY WITHIN MAJOR DIVISIONS. WHEN THERE IS ORGANIZATION INEVITABLY THERE ARE LEVELS OF HIERARCHIES OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY. INCREASING THE NUMBER OF LEVELS OF RESPONSIBILITY UNNECESSARILY INCREASES THE LENGTH OF THE LINE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND FREQUENTLY INVOLVES UNNECESSARY "RED TAPE" IN HANDLING MATTERS.

3. FUNCTIONING: THE SEVERAL LEVELS OF RESPONSIBILITY SHOULD BE CONSULTED WHEN FORMULATING EDUCATIONAL POLICIES. WHEN POLICIES HAVE BEEN DETERMINED AND THE RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ADMINISTERING SUCH POLICIES ASSIGNED TO INDIVIDUAL STAFF MEMBERS SHOULD BE GIVEN THE AUTHORITY TO ACT IN THEIR RESPECTIVE FIELDS WITHIN THE LIMITS OF DETERMINED POLICIES. THE VIOLATION OF THIS PRINCIPLE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF UNNECESSARY "RED TAPE." POLICIES SHOULD BE CAREFULLY DETERMINED AND CORRELATED THROUGH THE PROPER LEVELS OF RESPONSIBILITY BUT WHEN THE RESPONSIBILITY OF ADMINISTERING A POLICY HAS BEEN ASSIGNED TO A STAFF MEMBER, HE SHOULD BE GIVEN THE AUTHORITY TO ACT. IF, HOWEVER, THE HANDLING OF A MATTER INVOLVES THE ADOPTION OF A NEW POLICY OR THE CHANGE OF AN ESTABLISHED POLICY, THE STAFF MEMBER MUST FOLLOW THE PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED BY THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION FOR FORMULATION OF POLICIES. THIS MANNER OF FUNCTIONING MAKES IT NECESSARY FOR ALL PERSONS ON EACH LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY TO KEEP THE EXECUTIVE HEAD OF THAT LEVEL ADVISED CONCERNING THEIR IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES AND THE HEAD OF THE NEXT LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY ADVISED CONCERNING THE IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES OF HIS AREA. THIS INVOLVES SYSTEMATIC REPORTING ON SIGNIFICANT ITEMS. GREAT CARE MUST BE TAKEN, HOWEVER, TO SEE THAT SUCH REPORTS ARE MEANINGFUL AND NECESSARY.

4. UNITY OF COMMAND: PLANNED ORGANIZATION DEMANDS CLEARLY DEFINED LINES OF RESPONSIBILITY ACCOMPANIED BY THE DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY COMMENSURATE WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY. MEMBERS OF THE STAFF SHOULD NOT BE SUBJECTED TO INSTRUCTIONS FROM MORE THAN ONE PERSON ON EACH LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY. INSTRUCTIONS SHOULD BE CONFINED TO CHANNELS IN THE ESTABLISHED DIRECT LINE OF RESPONSIBILITY. ANY OTHER PROCEDURE WILL RESULT IN CONFUSION AND NEEDLESS FRICTION.

4. DIVISION OF WORK: THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION SHOULD BE DIVIDED INTO A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF WORK DIVISIONS TO COVER THE MAJOR AREAS OF SERVICE BUT THE NUMBER OF DIVISIONS SHOULD NOT BE SO GREAT AS TO HINDER COORDINATION OF SERVICES OR AS TO REQUIRE THE DEAN TO DEAL WITH AN UNREASONABLY LARGE NUMBER OF DIVISION HEADS.

6. COORDINATION: PLANNED ORGANIZATION REQUIRES FACILITIES FOR COORDINATION. THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION INTO MAJOR WORK DIVISIONS IS TO FACILITATE COORDINATION OF WORK IN HOMOGENEOUS AREAS OF SERVICE. HOWEVER, THERE MUST BE COORDINATION OF WORK WITHIN A MAJOR DIVISION AND AMONG MAJOR DIVISIONS.

COORDINATION MAY BE SECURED BY TWO METHODS, ORGANIZATIONAL AND LEADERSHIP. ANY APPROACH TO COMPLETE DOORDINATION CAN BE SECURED ONLY BY THE COMPLEMENTARY USE OF BOTH OF THESE METHODS. LEADERSHIP MAY BE THOUGHT OF AS THE DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINDS OF THE STAFF MEMBERS OF AN INTELLIGENT UNITY OF PURPOSE AND THE WILL TO FIT THEIR TASKS INTO THE WHOLE WITH SKILL AND ENTHUSIASM.[5]

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ABOVE CRITERIA AND PRINCIPLES IMPLIED A DUAL NEED. FIRST, AN ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN NEEDED WAS TO FORMULATE THE ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND OVER-ALL PROGRAM, AND SECOND, A SEPARATE ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN WAS NEEDED TO EXECUTE THE POLICIES AGREED UPON AND TO IMPLEMENT THE TOTAL PROGRAM. UPON THE RECOMMENDATION OF A COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION, THE FOLLOWING PLAN WAS ADOPTED:

(A) AN ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN WHICH PROVIDED FOR TWO COMPLETE FUNCTIONING PROCESSES: (1) A COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION FOR

---

[5]COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, "STATEMENT PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION," APRIL 5, 1949 (TYPEWRITTEN).

THE FORMULATION OF POLICIES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OVERALL PROGRAM; AND (2) A LINE ORGANIZATION FOR THE EXECUTION OF POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OVERALL PROGRAM.

(b) THE POLICY FORMING AN OVERALL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION HAS THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS:

(1) THE TOTAL FACULTY IS PLACED AT THE TOP OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR POLICY FORMING AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT.

(2) A PLANNING AND POLICIES COMMITTEE, COMPOSED OF THE HEADS OF THE DEPARTMENTS PLUS THREE ELECTED MEMBERS FROM THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND THREE ELECTED MEMBERS FROM THE LABORATORY SCHOOL, EVOLVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS, WHICH ARE THEN SUBMITTED TO THE TOTAL FACULTY FOR A FINAL VOTE.

(3) A NUMBER OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES, APPOINTED BY THE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION WITH THE ADVICE AND COUNSEL OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE, STUDY CERTAIN SPECIFIC PROBLEMS AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE.

(c) THE LINE ORGANIZATION FOR THE EXECUTION OF POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WHOLE PROGRAM PROVIDES FOR A DIVISION OF LABOR IN AREAS WHICH ARE RELATIVELY HOMOGENEOUS. THERE ARE PRESENTLY NINE SUCH DEPARTMENTS, OF WHICH THE LABORATORY SCHOOL IS ONE. THE DIRECTOR OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL IS THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT PERSON AND

THE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION SERVES AS THE CHIEF SCHOOL OFFICER. THE DIRECTOR OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTS THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM, SUPERVISES TEACHING ACTIVITIES, AND APPOINTS, WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE DEAN, NEW PERSONNEL. THE DIRECTOR IS AN EX-OFFICO MEMBER OF ALL THE LABORATORY SCHOOL COMMITTEES, CHIEF OF WHICH IS THE CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE.

THE CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE IS A GROUP OF THE TEACHERS, SERVING ON AN ELECTIVE BASIS, WHO REPRESENT THE TOTAL FACULTY IN MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE OVERALL OPERATION OF THE SCHOOL. STAFF MEMBERS HAVE COMPLETE ACCESS TO THE CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE, AND ALL OF ITS ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ARE SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY THE FACULTY. THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE SERVES AS A CLEARING HOUSE FOR DEALING WITH CURRENT SCHOOL AFFAIRS AS WELL FOR PLANNING ON A LONG RANGE BASIS.

AMONG OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE SUGGESTS THE AGENDA FOR EACH FACULTY MEETING. THE COMMITTEE'S CHAIRMAN SERVES BY ROTATION. HE PRESIDES AT THE GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE STAFF DURING HIS MONTH'S TERM OF OFFICE, OR UNTIL SUCH TIME AS ANOTHER CHAIRMAN IS ELECTED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE CENTRAL GROUP. HE IS ALSO THE ACTING DIRECTOR OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL IN THE ABSENCE OF ITS DIRECTOR.

THE ENROLLMENT OF THE SCHOOL STANDS AT 510 PUPILS. ALL GRADES EXCEPT NINE THROUGH TWELVE HAVE THIRTY PUPILS EACH; THE HIGH SCHOOL

HAS TWO SECTIONS PER CORE CLASS THAT CAN HAVE A MAXIMUM OF THIRTY PUPILS PER SECTION. THESE FIGURES ARE PEGGED MAINLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF FACILITATING EXPERIMENTATION. A WAITING LIST IS USED TO SECURE NEW STUDENTS. THIS LIST IS DIVIDED PERCENTAGEWISE AS FOLLOWS: 60 PER CENT OF THE INCOMING PUPILS MUST COME FROM FAMILIES NON-UNIVERSITY CONNECTED; 40 PER CENT MAY COME FROM FAMILIES CONNECTED WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA—OF THIS FIGURE 10 PER CENT MAY COME FROM THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION FAMILIES, WHILE 30 PER CENT MUST BE DERIVED FROM FAMILIES IN OTHER PARTS OF THE UNIVERSITY.

A REGISTRATION FEE OF $3.50 IS CHARGED IN K-6; THE SECONDARY SCHOOL FEE IS $5.00. AN ACTIVITY FEE OF $4.50 PER SEMESTER IS PAID BY EACH STUDENT IN THE SEVENTH THROUGH THE TWELFTH GRADES. EVERY EFFORT POSSIBLE IS MADE TO KEEP THESE FEES ON A NOMINAL BASIS SO AS NOT TO PREVENT ANY STUDENT FROM ATTENDING THE SCHOOL. THEY ARE WAIVED IF THE FAMILY CANNOT PAY THEM.

FINANCE

THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL RECEIVES PART OF THE FUNDS FOR ITS OPERATION FROM THE ALACHUA COUNTY BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION AND PART FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA. THE FUNDS PROVIDED BY THE ALACHUA COUNTY BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION ARE COMPUTED ON THE SAME BASIS AS THAT PROVIDED FOR ALL PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE UNDER THE MINIMUM FOUNDATION PROGRAM.

STATED FUNCTIONS

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL IN RELATION TO THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM HAVE BEEN DEFINED AND ARE IN

BULLETIN FORM.[6] THEY ARE (1) TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN WHO ATTEND THE SCHOOL; (2) TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE PRE-SERVICE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS; (3) TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE IN-SERVICE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHERS AND TEACHING AND (4) TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF EDUCATIONAL THEORY AND PRACTICE THROUGH EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH.

USE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL FOR OBSERVATION.—ONE OF THE MAIN USES OF THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL IS FOR OBSERVATION. THERE ARE FOUR COURSES IN THE FOUNDATIONS DEPARTMENT IN WHICH THE PRE-SERVICE STUDENTS ARE REQUIRED TO MAKE A NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS AS PART OF THEIR LABORATORY EXPERIENCES. THEY ARE (1 AND 2), EDF 140-141, "ASPECTS OF HUMAN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT," (3) EDF 440, "CHILD DEVELOPMENT," AND (4) EDF 442, "EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY." IN EACH OF THESE COURSES THE STUDENT IS REQUIRED TO MAKE A NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS OF GROUPS OF CHILDREN OR A GIVEN INDIVIDUAL, OR HOW A TEACHER WORKS IN THE CLASSROOM.

IN-SERVICE TEACHERS ARE ALSO ON MANY OCCASIONS IN THE CLASS OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. OFTENTIMES, FACULTIES COME IN A BODY TO VISIT. IT HAS BEEN ESTIMATED THAT IN 1954-55 OVER 40,000 OBSERVATIONS WERE MADE IN THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL.

USE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL FOR PARTICIPATION.—PARTICIPATION IS BEING USED ON A LIMITED BASIS IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY TEACHERS BUT IS USED QUITE EXTENSIVELY IN THE

---

[6]COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, "TEACHERS HANDBOOK—P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL," 1954-1955 (MIMEOGRAPHED).

PRE-SERVICE EDUCATION OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS. IT IS THOUGHT THAT PARTICIPATION IN THE SECONDARY AREA WILL BE INCREASED NEXT YEAR.

STUDENTS IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION USUALLY TAKE EDE 300, A 15 HOUR COURSE ENTITLED "CHILDREN AND LEARNING," WHICH PREPARES THEM FOR THE INTERNSHIP. HERE THEY WORK SEVERAL HOURS DAILY WITH CHILDREN UNDER THE DIRECT SUPERVISION OF A SUPERVISOR BUT DO NOT ASSUME FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE GROUP.

STUDENTS IN SECONDARY EDUCATION TAKE EDS 300-301 AS A PREPARATION TO THEIR INTERNSHIP. THEY GO TO VARIOUS CLASSES IN THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL WHERE THEY ARE CALLED PARTICIPANTS. HERE THEY OBSERVE THE TEACHER AND HER TECHNIQUES. THE PARTICIPANT IS URGED TO PARTICIPATE IN CLASS DISCUSSIONS AS WELL AS TO MAKE OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS. HE IS NOT IN CHARGE OF OR RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CLASS.

USE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL FOR INTERNSHIP.--THE PROGRAM FOR THE SECONDARY MAJORS IS SOMEWHAT SIMILAR TO THAT FOR THE ELEMENTARY MAJORS. THE MAIN DIFFERENCE IS THAT IN THE JUNIOR YEAR THE SECONDARY MAJOR HAS ONLY A SIX HOUR BLOCK IN PREPARATION FOR THE INTERNSHIP AS COMPARED TO THE FIFTEEN HOUR BLOCK FOR THE ELEMENTARY STUDENT.[7]

THERE ARE NO ELEMENTARY STUDENTS INTERNING IN THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL. THE FIFTY-TWO INTERNS IN THE ELEMENTARY DEPARTMENT DURING THE SECOND SEMESTER 1954-55 INTERNED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS. THE ELEMENTARY INTERNSHIP HAS BEEN DESCRIBED AS HAVING

---

[7]ELEMENTARY EDUCATION STUDENTS GET A BACKGROUND OF SUBJECT MATTER FOR THE GRADES IN THEIR FIFTEEN HOUR COURSE WHILE SECONDARY EDUCATION STUDENTS GET THE SUBJECT MATTER OF TEACHING FIELDS IN VARIOUS OTHER COLLEGES ON THE CAMPUS.

FOUR PHASES AS COMPARED TO THREE PHASES FOR THE SECONDARY. THE FIRST PHASE CONSISTS OF ONE WEEK ON CAMPUS FOR SEMINARS. THE SECOND PHASE CONSISTS OF SIX OR SEVEN WEEKS OF INTERNSHIP IN A PUBLIC SCHOOL, AT THE CONCLUSION OF WHICH THE INTERN IS BROUGHT BACK ON CAMPUS FOR ANOTHER WEEK OF SEMINARS. THE INTERN THEN GOES BACK TO THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOR SIX OR SEVEN WEEKS MORE OF INTERNSHIP FOR THE THIRD PHASE. THE FOURTH AND FINAL PHASE OF THE ELEMENTARY INTERNSHIP CONSISTS OF THE LAST WEEK ON CAMPUS FOR MORE SEMINARS.

THE SECONDARY INTERNSHIP CONSISTS OF THREE PHASES. THE FIRST PHASE CONSISTS OF THREE WEEKS ON CAMPUS, THE MORNING SESSION DEVOTED TO GENERAL METHODS AND THE AFTERNOON SESSION TO SPECIAL METHODS. AT THE END OF THIS THREE WEEKS PERIOD THE INTERN ENTERS HIS SECOND PHASE BY BEING ASSIGNED TO A PUBLIC SCHOOL FOR A PERIOD OF TEN WEEKS. FOR THE THIRD PHASE, THE LAST THREE WEEKS, THE INTERN IS BROUGHT BACK TO THE CAMPUS FOR ADDITIONAL SPECIAL METHODS AND GENERAL SEMINARS. DURING THE SECOND SEMESTER OF 1954-55 THERE WERE FOUR SECONDARY INTERNS IN THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL. THERE WERE SEVENTY-NINE SECONDARY INTERNS OUT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF FLORIDA.

USE OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL FOR EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH. —THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL HAS BEEN FEATURED IN SEVERAL PRINTED DESCRIPTIVE STUDIES AND IN TWENTY-ONE MASTER'S THESES. MEAD[8] COMPILED A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PRINTED MATERIALS WHICH CONCERNS THE LABORATORY SCHOOL. OF THESE, ONLY ONE COULD BE CLASSIFIED AS BEING

---

[8] A. R. MEAD, P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL, A BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE HISTORY, PROGRAM AND CHILDREN OF THE SCHOOL, 1934-1944, BULLETIN NO. 33, BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, MARCH, 1944.

PLANNED EXPERIMENTATION IN THAT A PROBLEM EXISTED, AN HYPOTHESIS WAS SET UP, AND DATA WERE SECURED TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM. THIS WAS AN EXPERIMENT WITH COMBINED SMALL CLASSES IN A HIGH SCHOOL TO ASCERTAIN WHAT RESULTS AND WHAT CONDITIONS MUST EXIST FOR SUCH A COMBINATION TO BE FAIRLY EFFECTIVE. THE SUBJECT USED WAS MATHEMATICS. THIS EXPERIMENT WAS PUBLISHED FIRST IN A MIMEOGRAPHED BULLETIN,[9] AND LATER IT WAS PUBLISHED IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION.[10] NO EXPERIMENTAL STUDY CONDUCTED IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL HAS EVER BEEN REVIEWED IN THE REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH WHICH IS DEVOTED TO SUMMARIZING SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH IN EDUCATION.

KITCHING,[11] IN THE 1955 YEARBOOK OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING REPORTED ON RECENT EXPERIMENTATION IN THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL. EXPERIMENTATION IN THE CORE PROGRAM HAS BEEN DONE IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS: (1) THE DISCOVERY OF METHODS TO IMPROVE THE TEACHING OF FUNCTIONAL MATHEMATICS NEEDED BY ALL PEOPLE LIVING IN TODAY'S WORLD; (2) THE PLACE OF MENTAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION OF THE CHILD AND IMPROVING THE METHODS OF TEACHING IN THIS RESPECT; AND (3) THE STATUS OF THE SKILLS PROGRAM IN THE SCHOOL.

TWO DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS WERE RECENTLY COMPLETED THAT

---

[9] A. R. MEAD, K. P. KIDD, AND H. G. LEWIS, SMALL CLASSES IN FLORIDA HIGH SCHOOLS, BULLETIN NO. 15, BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, FEBRUARY, 1940.

[10] A. R. MEAD, K. P. KIDD, AND H. G. LEWIS, "AN EXPERIMENT WITH COMBINED SMALL CLASSES IN MATHEMATICS," EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION, MAY, 1940, PP. 396-399.

[11] EUGENE A. KITCHING, "UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA LABORATORY SCHOOL," FUNCTIONS OF A LABORATORY SCHOOL IN TEACHER EDUCATION, THIRTY-FOURTH YEARBOOK OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING (ONEONTA, NEW YORK: THE ASSOCIATION, 1955), P. 220.

reported studies within the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School. One was an experimental study of selected instructional materials in social class at the secondary level.[12] The other was a study of the relationship between the style of teacher participation in the total classroom group and the internal structure of subgroups in the classroom.[13]

Methods of Study and Treatment of Data

The questionnaire, as submitted to directors of American campus schools was given each faculty member of the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School. They were asked to indicate by a numerical rating the degree of emphasis that they were giving each of the functions in their respective classes to develop selected teacher competencies. The mean and standard deviation were calculated for each competency under each function. They are found in Exhibit F in the Appendix.

A product moment correlation was calculated to compare the relationship between the ratings of the elementary faculty of the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and the jury; between the secondary faculty and the jury; between the total faculty and the jury; and, between the total faculty and 100 laboratory schools. By the use

---

[12]Thomas J. Hill, "Experimental Study of Selected Instructional Material in Social Class at the Secondary Level." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Florida Gainesville, Florida, 1954.

[13]John T. Lovell, "A Study of the Relationship Between the Style of Teacher Participation in the Total Classroom Group and the Internal Structure of Subgroups in the Classroom." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 1954.

of the Wallace-Snedecor Tables,[14] the level of confidence was determined for each coefficient of correlation. An explanation of the level of confidence was made in Chapter IV.

Mean Scores of Faculties, Jurors, and Directors

Table 7 presents a summary of data which is cited in the Master Data Sheet in the Appendix. A discussion by function follows:

Observation.—By comparing the mean scores in Table 7 it can be shown that the degree to which teacher competencies are being developed by Observation is:

1. Slightly less by the elementary faculty than by the 100 laboratory schools.

2. Less by the elementary faculty than the degree recommended by the jury.

3. Less by the elementary faculty than by the secondary faculty.

4. More by the secondary faculty than by the 100 laboratory schools.

5. More by the total faculty than by the 100 laboratory schools.

6. Slightly less by the total faculty than the degree recommended by the jury.

7. Slightly more by the secondary faculty than the degree recommended by the jury.

Participation.—By comparing the mean scores on Table 7 it can be shown that the degree to which teacher competencies are being

TABLE 7

MEAN RATING AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE SIX GROUPS OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES AS RATED BY THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL FACULTY, 100 LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS AND A JURY OF SELECTED LEADERS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Groups of Teacher Competencies	Function	100 Laboratory Schools		Jury	
		M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
	Observation				
1.	As a Director of Learning	2.3	.4	2.6	.3
2.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	1.6	.3	2.1	.4
3.	As a Mediator of the Culture	2.0	.2	2.2	.1
4.	As a Member of the School Community	1.4	.2	1.9	.2
5.	As a Liaison Between School and Community	1.2	.2	1.8	.2
6.	As a Member of the Profession	1.8	.2	2.1	.3
	Total Mean Score	1.7		2.1	
	Participation				
1.	As a Director of Learning	2.5	.3	3.0	.3
2.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	1.9	.4	2.5	.4
3.	As a Mediator of the Culture	2.2	.3	2.7	.3
4.	As a Member of the School Community	1.6	.2	2.3	.3
5.	As a Liaison between School and Community	1.4	.2	2.0	.2
6.	As a Member of the Profession	1.9	.2	2.6	.2
	Total Mean Score	1.9		2.5	

TABLE 7--CONTINUED

P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL					
ELEMENTARY FACULTY		SECONDARY FACULTY		TOTAL FACULTY	
M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
2.5	.6	2.7	.4	2.6	.5
2.1	.9	2.3	.3	2.2	.4
2.2	.5	2.5	.1	2.4	.1
.9	.3	1.8	.1	1.5	.2
.6	.4	1.5	.1	1.2	.2
1.2	.6	2.3	.4	2.0	.4
1.6		2.2		2.2	
3.2	.5	2.4	.5	2.6	.5
2.6	.6	1.9	.3	2.1	.3
3.1	.4	2.4	.1	2.6	.2
1.5	.4	1.6	.2	1.6	.3
1.3	.8	1.4	.1	1.4	.2
1.9	.5	2.1	.3	1.9	.2
2.3		2.0		2.1	

TABLE 7—CONTINUED

GROUPS OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES	FUNCTION	100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS		JURY	
		M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
	STUDENT TEACHING				
1.	AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING	3.4	.2	3.3	.2
2.	AS A COUNSELOR AND GUIDANCE WORKER	2.8	.4	3.0	.3
3.	AS A MEDIATOR OF THE CULTURE	3.1	.3	3.3	.2
4.	AS A MEMBER OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY	2.6	.2	2.8	.2
5.	AS A LIAISON BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY	2.4	.3	2.4	.4
6.	AS A MEMBER OF THE PROFESSION	2.8	.3	2.9	.3
	TOTAL MEAN SCORE	2.9		3.0	
	EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING				
1.	AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING	1.2	.1	2.6	.2
2.	AS A COUNSELOR AND GUIDANCE WORKER	1.0	.1	2.7	.2
3.	AS A MEDIATOR OF THE CULTURE	1.2	.1	3.0	.1
4.	AS A MEMBER OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY	1.2	.1	2.8	.4
5.	AS A LIAISON BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY	1.0	.1	2.7	.2
6.	AS A MEMBER OF THE PROFESSION	1.5	.1	3.2	.2
	TOTAL MEAN SCORE	1.2		2.8	

TABLE 7--CONTINUED

P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL					
ELEMENTARY FACULTY		SECONDARY FACULTY		TOTAL FACULTY	
M.	S.D.	M.	S. D.	M.	S.D.
*		2.9	.3	2.9	.3
		2.5	.2	2.5	.2
		2.8	.2	2.8	.2
		2.4	.2	2.4	.2
		1.9	.1	1.9	.1
		2.5	.2	2.5	.2
		2.5		2.5	
.5	.2	1.2	.1	.9	.1
.5	.2	1.1	.1	.9	.1
.9	.3	1.2	.1	1.1	.2
.5	.5	1.2	.1	1.0	.1
.5	.2	1.0	.1	.9	.1
.5	.2	1.5	.2	1.3	.2
.6		1.2		1.0	

TABLE 7—CONTINUED

GROUPS OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES	FUNCTION	100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS		JURY	
		M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
	EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH				
1.	AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING	.8	.1	2.0	.3
2.	AS A COUNSELOR AND GUIDANCE WORKER	.7	.1	1.9	.3
3.	AS A MEDIATOR OF THE CULTURE	.8	.1	2.1	.1
4.	AS A MEMBER OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY	.8	.1	1.9	.4
5.	AS A LIAISON BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY	.7	.1	1.8	.1
6.	AS A MEMBER OF THE PROFESSION	.8	.1	1.6	.3
	TOTAL MEAN SCORE	.8		1.9	

*THERE WERE NO ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHERS IN THE P. K. YONGE

TABLE 7--CONTINUED

P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL					
ELEMENTARY FACULTY		SECONDARY FACULTY		TOTAL FACULTY	
M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
.4	.2	1.2	.2	1.0	.2
.3	.2	1.0	.2	.8	.2
.7	.3	1.3	.1	1.2	.1
.3	.2	1.3	.2	1.1	.1
.3	.3	1.0	.1	.8	.1
.2	.1	1.6	.1	1.3	.1
.4		1.2		1.0	

LABORATORY SCHOOL DURING 1954-1955.

DEVELOPED BY PARTICIPATION IS:

1. MORE BY THE ELEMENTARY FACULTY THAN BY THE 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS.

2. SLIGHTLY LESS BY THE ELEMENTARY FACULTY THAN THE DEGREE RECOMMENDED BY THE JURY.

3. SLIGHTLY MORE BY THE SECONDARY FACULTY THAN BY 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS.

4. SLIGHTLY MORE BY THE ELEMENTARY FACULTY THAN BY THE SECONDARY SECONDARY FACULTY.

5. SLIGHTLY MORE BY THE TOTAL FACULTY THAN BY THE 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS.

6. LESS BY THE TOTAL FACULTY THAN THE DEGREE RECOMMENDED BY THE JURY.

7. LESS BY THE SECONDARY FACULTY THAN THE DEGREE RECOMMENDED BY THE JURY.

Student Teaching.--A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN SCORES IN TABLE 7 SHOWS THAT THE DEGREE TO WHICH TEACHER COMPETENCIES ARE BEING DEVELOPED BY STUDENT TEACHING IS:

1. LESS BY THE SECONDARY FACULTY THAN BY THE 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS.

2. LESS BY THE SECONDARY FACULTY THAN THE DEGREE RECOMMENDED BY THE JURY.

3. INASMUCH AS THERE ARE NO STUDENT TEACHERS IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL THE RATING OF THE TOTAL FACULTY IS THE SAME AS THAT OF THE SECONDARY FACULTY.

Experiences after Student Teaching.--A COMPARISON OF MEAN

scores in Table 7 indicate that the degree to which teacher competencies are being developed by Experiences after Student Teaching is:

1. Substantially less by the elementary faculty than by the 100 laboratory schools.

2. Substantially less by the elementary faculty than the degree recommended by the jury.

3. Substantially less by the elementary faculty than by the secondary faculty.

4. To the same degree by the secondary faculty as by the 100 laboratory schools.

5. Slightly less by the total faculty than by the 100 laboratory schools.

6. Substantially less by the total faculty than the degree recommended by the jury.

7. Substantially less by the secondary faculty than the degree recommended by the jury.

Experimentation and Research.—By comparing the mean scores in Table 7 it can be shown that the degree to which teacher competencies is being developed by Experimentation and Research is:

1. Less by the elementary faculty than by the 100 laboratory schools.

2. Substantially less by the elementary faculty than the degree recommended by the jury.

3. Substantially less by the elementary faculty than by the secondary faculty.

4. More by the secondary faculty than by the 100 laboratory

SCHOOLS.

5. LESS BY THE SECONDARY FACULTY THAN THE DEGREE RECOMMENDED BY THE JURY.

6. SLIGHTLY MORE BY THE TOTAL FACULTY THAN BY THE 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS.

COMPARISON BY GROUPS OF COMPETENCIES

TABLE 8 PRESENTS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FACULTIES OF P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL, 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS AND THE JURY FOR EACH FUNCTION.

P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND JURY RATINGS

THE OPINIONS OF ELEMENTARY AND OF SECONDARY SCHOOL FACULTIES OF THE CAMPUS SCHOOL USED AS A CASE STUDY WERE OBTAINED FOR COMPARISON WITH THE JURORS' JUDGMENTS.

COMPARISON OF THE ELEMENTARY FACULTY AND JURY.— THE DEGREE OR RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RATINGS OF ELEMENTARY FACULTY OF P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND THE RATINGS OF JURORS HAD SEVERAL OBTAINED R'S UNDER THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS WHICH WERE SIGNIFICANT AT THE 1 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE OR AT THE 5 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE.

UNDER THE FUNCTION OF OBSERVATION THE OBTAINED R FOR THE GROUP ENTITLED AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING WAS THE ONLY SIGNIFICANT R AND IT WAS SIGNIFICANT AT THE 1 PER CENT LEVEL.

UNDER THE FUNCTION OF PARTICIPATION THE OBTAINED R WAS SIGNIFICANT FOR THREE GROUPS OF COMPETENCIES. THE GROUPS ENTITLED AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING WITH A HIGH CORRELATION OF .78 AND AS A COUNSELOR AND GUIDANCE WORKER, ALSO WITH A HIGH CORRELATION OF .84 WERE BOTH

TABLE 8

THE DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP, AS EXPRESSED BY COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION, EXISTING BETWEEN THE RATINGS OF THE FACULTIES OF THE P.K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND THE RATINGS OF THE JURY AND OF A 100 LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS FOR THE SIX GROUPS OF COMPETENCIES UNDER EACH OF THE FIVE FUNCTIONS

Groups of Teacher Competencies	Function	Coefficients Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and Jury
	Observation	
1.	As a Director of Learning	.48*
2.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	.55
3.	As a Mediator of the Culture	-.50
4.	As a Member of the School Community	-.42
5.	As a Liaison between School and Community	.59
6.	As a Member of the Profession	.51
	Participation	
1.	As a Director of Learning	.78*
2.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	.84*
3.	As a Mediator of the Culture	.32
4.	As a Member of the School Community	.86**
5.	As a Liaison between School and Community	.79
6.	As a Member of the Profession	.09

TABLE 8—CONTINUED

OF CORRELATION BETWEEN RATINGS OF:		
SECONDARY FACULTY OF P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND JURY	TOTAL FACULTY OF P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND JURY	TOTAL FACULTY OF P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS
.76*	.72*	.84*
.62	.52	.80*
.52	-.15	.85
.78	.69	.52
.49	.85	.64
.59	.59	.73
.69*	.78*	.90*
.63	.79*	.77*
.56	-.33	.94**
.76	.82**	.86**
.76	.84	.86
.54	.42	.68

TABLE 8—CONTINUED

Groups of Teacher Competencies	Function	Coefficients Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and Jury
	Student Teaching	
1.	As a Director of Learning	***
2.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	
3.	As a Mediator of the Culture	
4.	As a Member of the School Community	
5.	As a Liaison between School and Community	
6.	As a Member of the Profession	
	Experiences after Student Teaching	
1.	As a Director of Learning	.04
2.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	.62
3.	As a Mediator of the Culture	.20
4.	As a Member of the School Community	.75
5.	As a Liaison between School and Community	-.58
6.	As a Member of the Profession	.59
	Experimentation and Research	
1.	As a Director of Learning	.56*
2.	As a Counselor and Guidance Worker	-.21
3.	As a Mediator of the Culture	-.03
4.	As a Member of the School Community	.64
5.	As a Liaison between School and Community	.93
6.	As a Member of the Profession	-.51

*Significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence.
**Significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence.
***There were no elementary student teachers in the P. K. Yonge

TABLE 8--CONTINUED

OF CORRELATION BETWEEN RATINGS OF:		
SECONDARY FACULTY OF P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND JURY	TOTAL FACULTY OF P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND JURY	TOTAL FACULTY OF P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS
.33	.33	.31
.86	.86	.77
-.23	-.23	.89
.79	.79	.31
.90	.90	.77
.51	.51	.55
.31	.25	.59*
.26	.58	.81*
-.51	-.10	.85
.72	.88**	.66
.90	.56	.04
.83**	.83**	.91**
.48*	.55*	.63*
.48	.37	.66**
-.56	-.33	.58
.21	.50	.66
-.66	.07	-.82
.51	.34	.40

LABORATORY SCHOOL DURING 1954-1955.

significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence. The group, As a member of the School Community, has an r of .86, showing a marked relationship between the ratings of the Laboratory School and the Jurors. This correlation was significant at the 5 per cent level.

Under the function of Experiences after Student Teaching there were no obtained r's which can be considered significant at either the 5 per cent of the 1 per cent level of confidence.

The function of Experimentation and Research had only one obtained r which was significant. This was for the group entitled As a Director of Learning which had an obtained r of .56, showing moderate correlation, significant at the 1 per cent level.

There were no r's obtained for the function of student teaching since no interns were placed in the P. K. Yonge Elementary School during the school year 1954-1955.

Comparison of Secondary Faculty and Jury.—The degree of relationship between the ratings of the secondary faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and the ratings of the jury were found to be significant at the 1 per cent or 5 per cent level of confidence for several of the groups under the various functions.

The group entitled As a Director of Learning, with an obtained r of .76 (a high correlation), was significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence under the function of Observation. This was the only group which had an obtained r that can be considered significant for the function of Observation.

The only significant correlation for the function of Participation was found to be in the group of teacher competencies entitled,

As a Director of Learning, which had a moderate correlation of .69 and was significant at the 1 per cent level.

Under the function of Student Teaching, there was no group which had an R that was found to be significant at either the 1 per cent or 5 per cent level of confidence.

The only group of competencies with an obtained R which showed a significance for the function of Experiences after Student Teaching was As a Member of the Profession which showed a high correlation of .83, significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence.

Under Experimentation and Research there was also only one group of teacher competencies, As a Director of Learning, which showed a significant correlation at either the 1 per cent or the 5 per cent level of confidence. This group, with a moderate correlation of .48, was significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence.

Comparison of the Total Faculty and Jury.—The coefficients of correlation obtained indicating the degree of relationship existing between the total faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and the Jury were significant for a total of seven groups of competencies under the various functions.

For the function of Observation the group entitled As a Director of Learning had an obtained R of .72, indicating a substantial relationship, which was significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence. There was no other significant R under the function of Observation.

There were three groups of competencies under the function of Participation with correlations which were significant at the 1 per cent or 5 per cent level of confidence. The groups called As a Director of Learning, with an obtained high R of .78, and As a Counselor and Guidance Worker, with an obtained high R of .79, were both significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence. The group entitled As a Member of the School Community with an obtained high R of .82 was significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence.

There were two groups which had R's with a significant level of confidence under the function of Experiences After Student Teaching. These groups, As a Member of the School Community, with a very dependable correlation of .88, and As a Liaison between School and Community, with a high R of .83 were both significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence.

The only group under function of Experimentation and Research which had an obtained R showing significance was As a Director of Learning which had a moderate correlation of .55, significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence.

There was no group under the function of Student Teaching which showed an obtained R significant at either the 1 per cent or 5 per cent level of confidence.

Comparison of Combined Faculties With the Directors

The opinions of the total faculty of the campus school used as a case study were obtained for comparison with the directors' ratings.

Comparison of Ratings Between Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and 100 Laboratory School Directors.—The degree

OF RELATIONSHIP FOUND BETWEEN THE RATINGS OF THE TOTAL FACULTY OF P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS WAS EXAMINED FOR EACH OF THE SIX GROUPS OF COMPETENCIES UNDER EACH OF THE FIVE FUNCTIONS. OF THE THIRTY OBTAINED R'S THERE WERE 11 CORRELATIONS WHICH WERE SIGNIFICANT AT THE 1 PER CENT LEVEL OR THE 5 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE.

THERE WERE FOUND TO BE TWO SIGNIFICANT GROUPS OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES UNDER OBSERVATION. BOTH OF THESE GROUPS—AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING WITH A HIGH R OF .84, AND AS A COUNSELOR AND GUIDANCE WORKER, WITH A HIGH R OF .80, WERE SIGNIFICANT AT THE 1 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE.

UNDER THE FUNCTION OF PARTICIPATION THERE WERE FOUR GROUPS OF COMPETENCIES WITH OBTAINED R'S SIGNIFICANT AT EITHER THE 1 PER CENT OR 5 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE. THIS FUNCTION HAD THE LARGEST NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT GROUPS OF COMPETENCIES OF THE NINETEEN MAJOR GROUPS OF RELATIONSHIP SHOWN IN TABLE 8. THE GROUPS ENTITLED AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING, WITH A VERY DEPENDABLE CORRELATION OF .90, AND AS A COUNSELOR AND GUIDANCE WORKER, WITH A HIGH CORRELATION OF .77, WERE BOTH SIGNIFICANT AT THE 1 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE. AS A MEDIATOR OF THE CULTURE, WITH A VERY HIGH CORRELATION OF .94, AND AS A MEMBER OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY, WITH A HIGH CORRELATION OF .86 WERE SIGNIFICANT AT THE 5 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE.

THE FUNCTION OF EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING INDICATED THE GROUPS OF AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING WITH A MODERATE CORRELATION OF .59, AND AS A COUNSELOR AND GUIDANCE WORKER WITH A HIGH CORRELATION OF .81, TO BE SIGNIFICANT AT THE 1 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE. THE

GROUP ENTITLED As A Member of the Profession WITH A VERY HIGH R OF .91 WAS SIGNIFICANT AT THE 5 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE.

THERE WERE TWO GROUPS OF COMPETENCIES UNDER Experimentation AND Research WHICH WERE FOUND TO HAVE R'S SIGNIFICANT AT THE 1 PER CENT OR 5 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE. THE GROUP ENTITLED As a Director of Learning WITH A SUBSTANTIAL CORRELATION OF .63 WAS SIGNIFICANT AT THE 1 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE. THE GROUP KNOWN AS As a Counselor and Guidance Worker WITH A SUBSTANTIAL CORRELATION OF .66 WAS SIGNIFICANT AT THE 5 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE.

IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT EVEN THOUGH SOME OF THE OBTAINED CORRELATIONS IN TABLE 8 WERE HIGH, THEY WERE NOT CONSIDERED TO BE SIGNIFICANT AT EITHER THE 1 PER CENT OR THE 5 PER CENT LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE. THIS IS DUE TO THE FACT THAT THE NUMBER OF THE ITEMS IN SOME OF THE GROUPS OF COMPETENCIES WAS SMALL AND DID NOT LEND THEMSELVES TO CERTAIN CORRELATION TECHNIQUES.

Ratings of Functions by Faculties, Directors, and Jurors

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION WERE ALSO CALCULATED FOR THE TOTAL FIFTY-SEVEN COMPETENCIES UNDER EACH FUNCTION. THESE COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATIONS ARE SHOWN IN TABLE 9. AN INTERPRETATION OF THESE RELATIONSHIPS BY FUNCTION FOLLOWS.

Observation.—THERE IS A SUBSTANTIALLY HIGHER RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SECONDARY FACULTY AND THE JURY THAN BETWEEN THE ELEMENTARY FACULTY AND THE JURY. THERE IS A CONSIDERABLEY HIGHER RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS THAN BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE JURY.

Participation.—THERE IS A CLOSER RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE

TABLE 9

THE DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP FOR THE FIVE FUNCTIONS, AS EXPRESSED BY COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION, EXISTING BETWEEN THE FACULTIES OF THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL AND THE JURY AND 100 LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS

Function	Coefficients of Correlation between the Ratings of: Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge and Jury	Secondary Faculty of P. K. Yonge and Jury	Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge and Jury	Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge and 100 Laboratory School Directors
1. Observation	.46	.70	.67	.76
2. Participation	.71	.61	.71	.84
3. Student Teaching	**	.40	.40	.47
4. Experiences after Student Teaching	.24*	.37	.39	.68
5. Experimentation and Research	.34	.39	.44	.58

**No student teaching was done in the Elementary School of the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School during the school year 1954-1955.

*The only obtained R in the above group that was not significant at the 1 per cent level.

ELEMENTARY FACULTY AND THE JURY THAN BETWEEN THE SECONDARY FACULTY AND THE JURY. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS WAS HIGHER THAN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE JURY.

STUDENT TEACHING.--THERE IS A CLOSER RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS THAN BETWEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE JURY.

EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING.--A CONSIDERABLY CLOSER RELATIONSHIP WAS FOUND BETWEEN THE SECONDARY FACULTY AND THE JURY THAN WAS FOUND BETWEEN THE ELEMENTARY FACULTY AND THE JURY. THERE IS A SUBSTANTIALLY HIGHER RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS THAN BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE JURY.

EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH.--THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SECONDARY FACULTY AND THE JURY IS ONLY SLIGHTLY HIGHER THAN BETWEEN THE ELEMENTARY FACULTY AND THE JURY. THERE IS CONSIDERABLY MORE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE 100 LABORATORY SCHOOLS THAN BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE JURY.

SUMMARY

THIS CHAPTER HAS PRESENTED A BRIEF BACKGROUND OF THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL INCLUDING ITS ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE. ITS PROGRAMS OF OBSERVATION, PARTICIPATION, INTERNSHIP, AND EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH WERE DISCUSSED.

COMPARISONS WERE MADE OF THE MEAN SCORES OF EACH GROUP OF COMPETENCIES UNDER EACH FUNCTION AS INDICATED BY 100 LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS, A JURY OF TEACHER EDUCATION EXPERTS, AND THE

FACULTIES OF THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL. THESE WERE MADE TO COMPARE THE DEGREE TO WHICH COMPETENCIES ARE BEING DEVELOPED WITH THE DEGREE TO WHICH THEY SHOULD BE DEVELOPED. COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION WERE CALCULATED TO DETERMINE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RATINGS OF THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL, THE JURY AND THE DIRECTORS OF THE 100 AMERICAN LABORATORY SCHOOLS.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE DATA PRESENTED IN THIS CHARTER REVEALS:

1. THE OBTAINED R OF .71 FOR PARTICIPATION INDICATES A SUBSTANTIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ELEMENTARY FACULTY AND THE JURY. THE OBTAINED CORRELATIONS WERE LOW FOR OBSERVATION, EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING, AND EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH, AND THEREFORE, INDICATED A LOW RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ELEMENTARY FACULTY AND THE JURY FOR THESE FUNCTIONS.

2. THE OBTAINED R OF .70 FOR OBSERVATION INDICATES A RATHER CLOSE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SECONDARY FACULTY AND THE JURY. FOR PARTICIPATION THERE IS AN R OF .61 WHICH INDICATES A MODERATE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SECONDARY FACULTY AND JURY. THE OBTAINED R'S FOR STUDENT TEACHING, EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING, AND EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH WERE SO LOW THAT VERY LITTLE AGREEMENT IS INDICATED FOR THESE FUNCTIONS BETWEEN THE SECONDARY FACULTY AND THE JURY.

3. THERE IS A RATHER SUBSTANTIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE JURY AS INDICATED BY AN OBTAINED R OF .71 FOR PARTICIPATION AND AN R OF .67 FOR OBSERVATION. THERE IS ONLY SLIGHT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE JURY AS EVIDENCED BY THE LOW R'S THAT WERE OBTAINED FOR STUDENT TEACHING, EXPERIENCES AFTER

Student Teaching and Experimentation and Research.

4. The closest agreement between the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and 100 laboratory schools is for the function of Participation with an obtained R of .84. This is followed by Observation with an R of .76, Experiences After Student Teaching with an R of .68, Experimentation and Research with an R of .58, and Student Teaching with an R of .47. It is significant to note here that for each function there is a much closer agreement between the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and 100 laboratory schools than there is between the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and the jury.

Inasmuch as there is very little Student Teaching done in the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School the remaining functions are in a position to receive more attention. In light of the relationships brought out in this chapter it would follow that more emphasis should be given the function of Observation by the elementary faculty and that Participation be given more emphasis by the secondary faculty. Also that more emphasis be given to Experiences After Student Teaching by the total faculty.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

THIS STUDY WAS AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE THE RELATIVE EMPHASIS OF FIVE FUNCTIONS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE VARIOUS COMPETENCIES OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS. FOR MORE THAN A HUNDRED YEARS AMERICAN TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS HAVE USED CAMPUS SCHOOLS AS A REGULAR FACILITY FOR PROVIDING GUIDED EXPERIENCES. AS IN OTHER LEARNED PROFESSIONS, THERE IS A RECENT TENDENCY TO EMPHASIZE PRACTICAL EXPERIENCES MORE THAN EVER BEFORE THROUGOUT THE PERIOD OF TRAINING. AS RECENTLY AS FEBRUARY, 1949, STANDARD VI, OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS COLLEGES, WAS REVISED AND RE-EMPHASIZED AS A GUIDE FOR THE PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS OF TEACHER EDUCATION. THE FIVE FUNCTIONS USUALLY ASSIGNED TO LABORATORY SCHOOLS ARE: OBSERVATION, PARTICIPATION, STUDENT TEACHING, EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING, AND EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH.

ALSO, IN RECENT YEARS THERE HAS BEEN A TENDENCY IN TEACHER EDUCATION CIRCLES TO RE-STUDY THE COMPETENCIES EXPECTED OF BEGINNING TEACHERS. EXAMPLES OF RECENT COMPILATIONS ARE THE "MEASURE OF A GOOD TEACHER" PUBLISHED BY THE CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION IN 1952 AND "FACTORS IN TEACHING COMPETENCE" PUBLISHED IN 1954 BY THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS.

DESPITE THE FACT THAT RECENT EVALUATIVE STUDIES HAVE SHOWN THE INFLUENCE OF STANDARD VI ON THE THINKING OF TEACHER EDUCATORS, LEADERS HAVE CONTINUED TO RAISE QUESTIONS ON HOW MUCH EMPHASIS THE

LABORATORY SCHOOLS ARE REALLY GIVING TO THOSE FUNCTIONS WHICH AID IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIRED COMPETENCIES.

THE CENTRAL PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY WAS TO TRY TO DETERMINE HOW MUCH EMPHASIS LABORATORY SCHOOLS ARE GIVING THEIR ASSIGNED FUNCTIONS IN COMPARISON WITH THE THEORIES OF LEADERS IN THE FIELD OF TEACHER EDUCATION. MORE SPECIFICALLY, ANSWERS TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE SOUGHT:

1. HOW MUCH ARE THE FUNCTIONS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS AFFILIATED WITH INSTITUTIONS HOLDING MEMBERSHIP IN THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION BEING EMPHASIZED IN ACTUAL PRACTICE TO DEVELOP SELECTED TEACHER COMPETENCIES?
2. HOW MUCH EMPHASIS, AS DETERMINED BY A JURY OF LEADERS IN THE FIELD OF TEACHER EDUCATION, SHOULD BE PLACED ON THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS OF A CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOL TO DEVELOP SELECTED TEACHER COMPETENCIES?
3. HOW DOES THE EMPHASIS IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS COMPARE WITH THAT RECOMMENDED BY THE JURY?
4. HOW DOES THE EMPHASIS IN THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA COMPARE WITH THAT RECOMMENDED BY THE JURY?
5. HOW DOES THE EMPHASIS IN THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL COMPARE WITH THAT OF THE OTHER LABORATORY SCHOOLS?
6. ARE THERE ANY IDENTIFIABLE FACTORS THAT DETERMINE SPECIFIED FUNCTIONS OF A CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOL?

A LIST OF FIFTY-SEVEN DESIRED COMPETENCIES, CLASSIFIED INTO SIX GROUPS, WAS DERIVED FROM A SYNTHESIS OF RECENT COMPILATIONS OF TEACHER COMPETENCIES. AN INSTRUMENT WAS PREPARED FOR ELICITING THE JUDGMENTS OF REPRESENTATIVES OF VARIOUS GROUPS ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LABORATORY SCHOOL FUNCTIONS IN RELATION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIRED COMPETENCIES. SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES WERE RETURNED BY THIRTY-TWO JUROR-LEADERS IN TEACHER EDUCATION, 100 DIRECTORS OF CAMPUS SCHOOLS, AND THE THIRTY FACULTY MEMBERS OF THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL USED AS A CASE STUDY. THE RATINGS MADE BY THESE REPRESENTATIVES WERE TREATED STATISTICALLY BY USING THE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION AND THE PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION TECHNIQUE.

FINDINGS

OUT OF THE 115 LABORATORY SCHOOLS RETURNING QUESTIONNAIRES, STUDENT TEACHING WAS LISTED BY SIXTY-FOUR AS THEIR PRIMARY FUNCTION, OBSERVATION BY TWENTY-THREE, OBSERVATION AND PARTICIPATION BY SIXTEEN, PARTICIPATION BY NINE AND EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH BY THREE.

PRACTICES IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS.—TEACHER COMPETENCIES ARE BEING DEVELOPED IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS TO THE GREATEST DEGREE THROUGH STUDENT TEACHING, FOLLOWED BY PARTICIPATION AND OBSERVATION. THEY ARE BEING DEVELOPED TO A SMALLER DEGREE THROUGH EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING AND TO AN EVEN LESSER DEGREE THROUGH EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH.

THE DIRECTORS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS RANKED THE GROUPS OF COMPETENCIES THAT ARE BEING DEVELOPED: AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING,

As a Mediator of the Culture, As a Counselor and Guidance Worker, As a Member of the Profession, As a Member of the School Community and As a Liaison between School and Community. These groups of competencies assumed the same relative position under Observation, Participation, and Student Teaching. There were different orders of emphasis under Experiences after Student Teaching and Experimentation and Research.

Jurors' Opinions.—In the judgment of a jury of leaders in the field of teacher education, teacher competencies should be developed to the highest degree through Student Teaching, followed by Experiences After Student Teaching, Participation, Observation, and Experimentation and Research.

Under Student Teaching the jurors ranked the groups of competencies that should be developed as As a Director of Learning, As a Mediator of the Culture, As a Counselor and Guidance Worker, As a Member of the Profession, As a Member of the School Community, and As a Liaison between School and Community. Groups of competencies assumed the same relative position under Observation and Participation as under Student Teaching. There were different orders of emphasis under Experiences after Student Teaching and Experimentation and Research.

Practice Compared with Theory.—A comparison of the degree to which teacher competencies are being developed through five functions is less than the degree to which the experts say they should be developed. The greatest degree of relationship between the jury and the laboratory school directors was for the function of participation with an obtained r of .91, followed by Observation

WITH AN R OF .81, STUDENT TEACHING WITH AN R OF .66, EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH WITH AN R OF .61, AND EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING WITH AN R OF .45.

P. K. YONGE FACULTIES' AND THE JURORS' OPINIONS.—THE OPINIONS OF ELEMENTARY AND OF SECONDARY SCHOOL FACULTIES OF THE CAMPUS SCHOOL USED AS A CASE STUDY WERE OBTAINED FOR COMPARISON WITH THE JURORS' JUDGMENTS.

AN OBTAINED R OF .71 INDICATED A RATHER SUBSTANTIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ELEMENTARY FACULTY AND THE JURY FOR THE FUNCTION OF PARTICIPATION. THE OBTAINED R'S FOR OBSERVATION, EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING, AND EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH WERE SO LOW THAT ONLY A SLIGHT RELATIONSHIP WAS INDICATED.

THE OBTAINED R OF .70 FOR OBSERVATION INDICATED A CLOSE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SECONDARY FACULTY AND THE JURY. FOR PARTICIPATION THERE WAS AN R OF .61 WHICH INDICATED A MODERATE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SECONDARY FACULTY AND THE JURY. THE OBTAINED R'S FOR STUDENT TEACHING, EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING, AND EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH WERE SO LOW THAT VERY LITTLE AGREEMENT WAS INDICATED BETWEEN THE SECONDARY FACULTY AND JURY FOR THESE FUNCTIONS.

THERE WAS A RATHER SUBSTANTIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE JURY AS INDICATED BY AN OBTAINED R OF .71 FOR PARTICIPATION AND AN R OF .67 FOR OBSERVATION. THERE WAS ONLY SLIGHT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE TOTAL FACULTY AND THE JURY AS EVIDENCED BY THE LOW R'S THAT WERE OBTAINED FOR STUDENT TEACHING, EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING AND EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH. UNDER OBSERVATION,

Participation, and Student Teaching, the faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School ranked the groups of competencies that were being developed: As a Director of Learning, As a Mediator of the Culture, As a Counselor and Guidance Worker, As a Member of the Profession, As a Member of the School Community, and As a Liaison between School and Community. There were different orders of emphasis under Experiences after Student Teaching and Experimentation and Research.

Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and 100 Laboratory School Directors' Opinions.—The closest agreement between the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and 100 laboratory schools was for the function of Participation with an R of .84. This was followed by Observation with an R of .76, Experiences after Student Teaching with an R of .68, Experimentation and Research with an R of .58, and Student Teaching with an R of .47. It is significant to note here that for each function there was much closer agreement between the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and 100 Laboratory schools than there was between the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School and the jury.

Factors Influencing Functions.—One of the main determining factors as to why certain of the laboratory schools still has Student Teaching as their primary function was due to the continued availability of an adequate plant and appropriate facilities. This was also the main reason for a small number of schools listing Experimentation and Research as their primary function.

However, due to the increased numbers of student teachers and the inadequacy of the plant many campus schools have moved Student Teaching off the campus and have made observation,

Participation, and Observation and Participation their primary functions. It may be surmised that more laboratory schools would continue to have Student Teaching as their primary function if an adequate plant and appropriate facilities were available.

Conclusions

1. The laboratory school provides a professional resource which is convenient and easily accessible to all staff members and prospective teachers.

2. Each function has a definite role to play either directly or indirectly in the development of teacher competencies and therefore each function should be given a part in the total pattern of teacher education.

3. As laboratory experiences outside student teaching are being given increased emphasis in teacher education programs the use of laboratory school should assume a role of added importance.

4. The pattern of laboratory experiences for elementary teachers may vary from the pattern for secondary teachers.

5. The horizontal and vertical extension of the programs of the professional laboratory experiences of the pre-service programs calls for additional use, perhaps extension, of facilities to meet the needs of all students. Such an expansion makes essential the greater use of a variety of laboratory centers.

6. The campus school and its community are an integral part of the teacher education program and provide significant opportunities to study and relate the various phases of the teacher's activities both in and out of school.

7. As the professors in the fields of education, philosophy, psychology and curriculum continue to supplement theory with laboratory experiences there will be an increased demand for the use of campus schools as well as public schools in the service area of the teacher education institution.

8. Since Research and Experimentation plays a small part in the development of teacher competencies of prospective teachers, it is apparent that the professors of education in cooperation with the faculties of laboratory schools should attempt to develop this in the laboratory school. No less important in the long run than the other functions, it makes its contribution indirectly.

9. From the scant evidence available through this study it may be assumed that professors are not currently taking advantage of the proximity and administrative relationships for the utilization of Experimentation and Research.

10. The campus school can augment and reinforce the teacher education program in an athosphere that is free from the restrictions that often exist in the public schools.

Recommendations

1. Inasmuch as the development of teacher competencies is dependent upon proper functioning of a campus school, it is recommended that prospective faculty members in the laboratory school and in the department or college of education be given advanced professional preparation in the use of the campus school.

2. It is recommended that adequate laboratory schools be provided in teacher-preparing institutions; and, that antiquated and

INADEQUATE FACILITIES IN SOME OF THE INSTITUTIONS BE BROUGHT UP TO THE LEVEL IMPLIED IN STANDARD VI.

3. SINCE IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO ACCOMMODATE ALL THE STUDENT TEACHERS IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BEST POSSIBLE PROGRAMS BE SECURED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR THIS IMPORTANT AREA IN GUIDED LABORATORY EXPERIENCES.

4. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT DIRECTING TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS IN SELECTED PUBLIC SCHOOLS BE GIVEN PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION FOR DEVELOPING COMPETENCIES COMPLEMENTARY TO THE PROGRAMS OF CAMPUS SCHOOLS.

5. TO EMPLOY TO ADVANTAGE ALL THE OPPORTUNITIES OF THE LABORATORY SCHOOL, IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT IT BE USED NOT JUST FOR PROVIDING LABORATORY EXPERIENCES BUT ALSO FOR FURNISHING CONTACTS WITH ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES, GUIDANCE ACTIVITIES, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, AND A HOST OF OTHER ACTIVITIES WHICH EVERY LABORATORY SCHOOL SHOULD OFFER. THIS CONCEPT COMBINES THE "MODEL SCHOOL" OF TRADITION WITH THE FUNCTION DIRECTLY CONCERNED WITH EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

ALLEN, RAYMOND B. MEDICAL EDUCATION AND THE CHANGING ORDER. NEW YORK: COMMONWEALTH FUND, 1946.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION. FIFTH YEARBOOK. ONEONTA, NEW YORK: THE ASSOCIATION, 1952.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION. SIXTH YEARBOOK. ONEONTA, NEW YORK: THE ASSOCIATION, 1953.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION. SEVENTH YEARBOOK. ONEONTA, NEW YORK: THE ASSOCIATION, 1954.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION. RECOMMENDED STANDARDS GOVERNING PROGESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN STUDENT TEACHING AND EVALUATIVE CRITERIA. ONEONTA, NEW YORK: THE ASSOCIATION, 1949.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS COLLEGES. SCHOOL AND LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN TEACHER EDUCATION. ONEONTA, NEW YORK: THE ASSOCIATION, 1948.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS COLLEGES. YEARBOOK OF 1926. ONEONTA, NEW YORK: THE ASSOCIATION, 1926.

ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING. CURRICULUM TRENDS AND TEACHER EDUCATION. THIRTY-SECOND YEARBOOK OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING. LOCK HAVEN, PENNSYLVANIA: THE ASSOCIATION, 1953.

ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING. FACILITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN TEACHER EDUCATION. THIRTY-THIRD YEARBOOK OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING. LOCK HAVEN, PENNSYLVANIA: THE ASSOCIATION, 1954.

ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING. FUNCTIONS OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS IN TEACHER EDUCATION. THIRTY-FOURTH YEARBOOK OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR STUDENT TEACHING. LOCK HAVEN, PENNSYLVANIA: THE ASSOCIATION, 1955.

BERGEVIN, PAUL. INDUSTRIAL APPRENTICESHIP. NEW YORK: MCGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, 1947.

COMMISSION ON GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION. GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION. CHICAGO: UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, 1940.

DIETRICK, JOHN E., AND BERSON, ROBERT G. MEDICAL SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES. NEW YORK: McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, 1953.

DICTIONARY OF OCCUPATIONAL TITLES. PART I. WASHINGTON, D. C.: UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, 1949.

DOUGLAS, PAUL H. AMERICAN APPRENTICESHIP AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION. NEW YORK: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1921.

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. EDITED BY WALTER S. MONROE. NEW YORK: THE MCMILLAN CO., 1950, PP. 1446-1454.

FLEXNER, ABRAHAM. MEDICAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA. NEW YORK: CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING, 1910.

GUILFORD, J. P. FUNDAMENTAL STATISTICS IN PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION. NEW YORK: McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, INC., 1950.

HAGOOD, MARGARET J., AND PRICE, DAVID O. STATISTICS FOR SOCIOLOGISTS. NEW YORK: HENRY HOLT AND CO., 1952.

HARPER, CHARLES A. A CENTURY OF PUBLIC TEACHER EDUCATION. WASHINGTON, D. C.: AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS COLLEGES, 1939.

LARSON, LEONARD A., AND YOCUM, RACHEL D. MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION IN PHYSICAL HEALTH AND RECREATION EDUCATION. C. V. MOSBY, 1951.

MCCLOY, CHARLES H. TESTS AND MEASUREMENTS IN HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION. NEW YORK: F. S. CROFTS AND CO., 1942.

SORENSON, HERBERT. STATISTICS FOR STUDENTS OF PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION. NEW YORK: McGRAW-HILL BOOK CO., 1936.

TRAINING FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE. EDITED BY M. B. LAMBIE. CHICAGO: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SERVICE, 1945.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE. OCCUPATIONAL HANDBOOK OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE. WASHINGTON, D. C.: HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, 1954.

UNITED STATES ARMY. OCCUPATIONAL HANDBOOK OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY. WASHINGTON, D. C.: OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL, 1954.

UNITED STATES NAVY. OCCUPATIONAL HANDBOOK OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY. WASHINGTON, D. C.: BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL, 1954.

WILLIAMS, E. I. F. THE ACTUAL AND POTENTIAL USE OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS. NEW YORK: BUREAU OF PUBLICATIONS, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, 1942.

Periodicals

Barr, A. S. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations," Journal of Experimental Education. June, 1948, pp. 208-83.

Bucklen, Harry. "Campus School: What Are Its Functions?" Journal of Teacher Education. September, 1952, pp. 201-03.

Caswell, Hollis L. "The Professional Sequence in Teacher Education," Teachers College Record, March 1951, p. 339.

Domas, Simeon J., and Tiedeman, David V. "Teaching Competence: An Annotated Bibliography," Journal of Experimental Education, December, 1950, pp. 101-213.

Mead, A. R., Kidd, K. P., and Lewis, H. G., "An Experiment with Combined Small Classes in Mathematics," Educational Administration and Supervision, May, 1940, pp. 396-399.

Oliphant, Herman, "Parallels in the Development," American Academy of Political and Social Science, Annals, 167, May, 1944, p. 156.

Simpson, Sidney P. "The Function of the University Law School," Harvard Law Review, May, 1946, p. 1068.

Stone, Mason. "The First Normal School in America," Teachers College Record, May, 1923, p. 267.

Bulletins and Reports

California Teacher Association. Measure of a Good Teacher. San Francisco: The Association, 1952.

Leadership Training Conference for the AACTE Workshop, Illinois State Normal University, April, 1950.

National Education Association. Factors in Teaching Competence. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1954.

Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for the Year 1867-68, 1868, pp. 649-820.

State Responsibility for the Organization and Administration of Education, Bulletin No. 1, Southern States Work Conference on School Administration Problems, 1942.

Unpublished Material

College of Education, University of Florida, "Statement of Principles and Criteria for the Organization of the College of Education," April 5, 1949 (typewritten).

College of Education, University of Florida, "Teachers Handbook—P. K. Yonge Laboratory School," 1954–1955 (mimeographed).

Hill, Thomas J. "Experimental Study of Selected Instructional Material in Social Class at the Secondary Level." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 1954.

Lovell, John T. "A Study of the Relationship between the Style of Teacher Participation in the Total Classroom Group and the Internal Structure of Subgroups in the Classroom." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 1954.

Mead, A. R., "P. K. Yonge Laboratory School, A Bibliography on the History, Program and Children of the School, 1934–1944." Bulletin No. 33, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Florida, March, 1944 (mimeographed).

Mead, A. R., and Campbell, J. T. "The P. K. Yonge Laboratory School Building," Bulletin No. 1, College of Education, University of Florida, March, 1947 (mimeographed).

Mead, A. R., Kidd, K. P., and Lewis, H. G., "Small Classes in Florida High Schools," Bulletin No. 15, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Florida, February, 1940 (mimeographed).

APPENDIX

EXHIBIT A

QUESTIONNAIRE TO JUROR-LEADERS IN
TEACHER EDUCATION

EXHIBIT A

QUESTIONNAIRE TO JUROR-LEADERS IN
TEACHER EDUCATION

DEAR

WE HAVE RECEIVED YOUR CARD AND APPRECIATE YOUR WILLINGNESS TO SERVE AS A JUROR FOR THIS STUDY. ATTACHED HEREWITH IS THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE USED, THE MAIN PURPOSE OF WHICH IS TO DETERMINE THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS THAT SHOULD BE PLACED ON VARIOUS FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS TO DEVELOP SELECTED TEACHER COMPETENCIES. A SIMILAR QUESTIONNAIRE IS BEING SENT TO ALL THE CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS WITHIN THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND THEY WILL BE ASKED TO INDICATE BY A SIMILAR SCALE TO WHAT DEGREE THEY ARE IN ACTUAL PRACTICE EMPHASIZING EACH OF THEIR FUNCTIONS. THE RESULTS FROM THE CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS AND FROM THE JURY WILL BE COMPARED AND TREATED STATISTICALLY AND WILL RESULT IN A COMPARISON OF PRACTICE WITH THEORY.

A SELF-ADDRESSED STAMPED ENVELOPE IS ENCLOSED FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE AND WE WOULD APPRECIATE IT IF YOU COULD RETURN IT BY APRIL 11. PLEASE RETURN IT TO: CAREY T. SOUTHALL, P. K. YONGE SCHOOL, GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA.

VERY TRULY YOURS,

E. A. DAVIS, DIRECTOR
P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL

CAREY T. SOUTHALL
RESEARCH ASSISTANT

DEFINITIONS OF FUNCTIONS USED IN THIS STUDY:

OBSERVATION IS THAT PHASE OF LABORATORY EXPERIENCES OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS IN WHICH, UNDER DIRECTION, THEY STUDY PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES IN TEACHING AND MANAGING A CLASS, OR IT MIGHT BE OBSERVING CHILDREN PER SE. THIS INCLUDES OBSERVATION BY CLASS AND INDIVIDUALS.

PARTICIPATION IS THAT PHASE OF LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN WHICH THE PROSPECTIVE TEACHER, UNDER DIRECTION, HAS LIMITED CONTACT WITH PUPILS IN A CLASS BUT DOES NOT ASSUME FULL RESPONSIBILITY.

STUDENT-TEACHING OR INTERNSHIP IS THAT PERIOD OF GUIDED TEACHING WHEN A STUDENT TAKES AN INCREASING RESPONSIBILITY FOR WORK OF A GROUP OF LEARNERS OVER A PERIOD OF CONSECUTIVE WEEKS.

EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT-TEACHING ARE THOSE EXPERIENCES THAT MIGHT COME IN THE FORM OF SEMINARS, MORE OBSERVATIONS, FOLLOW-UP STUDIES, PROFESSIONAL COURSES, PARTICIPATION IN SPECIAL PROJECTS OR ACTIVITIES.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION: CAREFUL AND UNBIASED INVESTIGATION IN WHICH THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD IS INVOLVED, BASED INSOFAR AS POSSIBLE UPON DEMONSTRABLE FACTS AND INVOLVING REFINED DISTINCTIONS, INTERPRETATIONS AND USUALLY SOME GENERALIZATION.

BELOW IS A LIST OF SELECTED TEACHER COMPETENCIES AND IN THE COLUMN TO THE RIGHT ARE FIVE FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS. USING THE FOLLOWING RATING SCALE WOULD YOU PLEASE RATE EACH TEACHER COMPETENCY UNDER EACH FUNCTION: INSERT IN THE COLUMN TO THE RIGHT, 4, 3, 2, 1, OR 0 AS THE NUMBER THAT MOST NEARLY DESCRIBES THE EMPHASIS THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN EACH FUNCTION TO DEVELOP THAT COMPETENCY. PLEASE NOTE THAT EACH COMPETENCY IS TO BE RATED UNDER EACH FUNCTION.

4—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A VERY HIGH DEGREE
3—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A HIGH DEGREE
2—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO SOME DEGREE
1—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A SMALL DEGREE
0—SHOULD NOT BE EMPHASIZED OR USED AT ALL

TEACHER COMPETENCIES	FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS				
	OBSERVATION	PARTICIPATION	STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH
AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING					
1. PROVIDES A VARIETY OF LEARNING EXPERIENCES WHICH POSSESS MEANING FOR THE PUPIL					
2. APPEALS TO PUPIL INTEREST					
3. PROVIDES EFFECTIVE REVIEW PROCEDURE					
4. KNOWS HOME AND COMMUNITY INFLUENCES ON LEARNING ACTIVITIES					
5. HAS WORKING KNOWLEDGE OF PUPIL PHYSICAL HEALTH PROBLEMS					
6. PROVIDES FOR INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES					
7. PLANS COOPERATIVELY WITH PUPILS IN CLASSROOM					
8. WORKS WITH PUPILS IN A WAY TO BRING OUT LEADERSHIP QUALITIES					
9. ENCOURAGES DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURE IN CLASSROOM					
10. STIMULATES WIDE PARTICIPATION OF PUPILS IN CLASSROOM AT VARIOUS LEVELS OF ABILITY					
11. PROVIDES OPPORTUNITY TO DEVELOP ATTITUDES DEEMED SOCIALLY AND PSYCHOLOGICALLY DESIRABLE					
12. USES APPROPRIATE TECHNIQUES IN DISCUSSION AND PRESENTATION TECHNIQUES					

4—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A VERY HIGH DEGREE
3—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A HIGH DEGREE
2—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO SOME DEGREE
1—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A SMALL DEGREE
0—SHOULD NOT BE EMPHASIZED OR USED AT ALL

	FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS				
	OBSERVATION	PARTICIPATION	STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH
13. STIMULATES INDIVIDUAL INTERESTS AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY					
14. DEVELOPS SELF EVALUATION PROCEDURE IN PUPILS					
15. HELPS PUPILS SET UP ACCEPTABLE GOALS IN CLASS					
16. HELPS PUPILS SET UP ACCEPTABLE GOALS OUT OF CLASS					
17. USES AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS EFFECTIVELY IN INSTRUCTION					
18. STUDIES AND USES COMMUNITY RESOURCES					
19. USES RESOURCE PERSONNEL EFFECTIVELY					
20. MANAGES EFFECTIVELY PHYSICAL ASPECTS OF CLASSROOM					
21. DEMONSTRATES THOROUGH PLANNING IN HANDLING MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES					
22. SELECTS EFFECTIVELY, ADMINISTERS AND INTERPRETS DIAGNOSTIC TESTS					
23. EFFECTIVELY USES TEST RESULTS					
24. MAKES APPROPRIATE "TEACHER-MADE" TESTS					
25. MAKES CASE STUDIES, ANECDOTAL RECORDS AND CUMULATIVE FILES					
26. GRADES PUPILS EFFECTIVELY					
27. REPORTS PROGRESS OF PUPILS TO PARENTS EFFECTIVELY					

4—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A VERY HIGH DEGREE
3—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A HIGH DEGREE
2—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO SOME DEGREE
1—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A SMALL DEGREE
0—SHOULD NOT BE EMPHASIZED OR USED AT ALL

	FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS				
	OBSERVATION	PARTICIPATION	STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT-TEACHING	EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH
AS A COUNSELOR AND GUIDANCE WORKER					
28. STUDIES EACH PUPIL'S BACKGROUND					
29. RECOGNIZES SYMPTOMS OF EMOTIONAL MAL-ADJUSTMENT AND ASSISTS IN REMEDIAL PROGRAMS					
30. PROVIDES VOCATIONAL AND AVOCATIONAL GUIDANCE					
31. PROVIDES OPPORTUNITY FOR SUCCESS EXPERIENCE FOR ALL PUPILS					
32. KEEPS RECORDS SUITABLE FOR PERSONAL GUIDANCE					
33. MAINTAINS EFFECTIVE RELATIONSHIP WITH HOMES					
34. DIFFERENTIATES BETWEEN DIRECTIVE AND NON-DIRECTIVE TECHNIQUES IN COUNSELING					
35. RECOGNIZES OWN ABILITIES IN COUNSELING					
36. UNDERSTANDS BASIC PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVE COUNSELING					
AS A MEDIATOR OF THE CULTURE					
37. RELATES SUBJECT MATTER TO SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS					
38. UNDERSTANDS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BROAD FIELDS OF SUBJECT MATTER AS GENERAL EDUCATION					
39. IDENTIFIES KEY PROBLEMS IN SOCIETY AND DEFINES THE ISSUES					

4—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A VERY HIGH DEGREE
3—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A HIGH DEGREE
2—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO SOME DEGREE
1—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A SMALL DEGREE
0—SHOULD NOT BE EMPHASIZED OR USED AT ALL

	FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS					
	OBSERVATION	PARTICIPATION	STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT-TEACHING		EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH
40. DEVELOPS PUPIL-ATTITUDES NECESSARY FOR DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION IN SOCIETY						
41. USES THE COMMITTEE AS A LEARNING EXPERIENCE						
AS A MEMBER OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY						
42. DEMONSTRATES COMPETENCE IN CURRICULUM PLANNING						
43. PLANS COOPERATIVELY FOR EDUCATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES						
44. SHARES ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY						
45. WORKS ON SCHOOL EVALUATIVE PROJECTS						
46. PARTICIPATES IN PLANNING AND ADMINISTERING EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES						
47. STARTS WITH SCHOOLS WHERE THEY ARE AND WORKS FOR IMPROVEMENT						
AS A LIAISON BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY						
48. SECURES COOPERATION OF PARENTS IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES						
49. INTERPRETS THE SCHOOL TO THE COMMUNITY AND THE COMMUNITY TO THE PUPILS AND PARENTS						
50. ASSISTS LAY-GROUPS IN DEVELOPING AN UNDERSTANDING OF MODERN EDUCATION						
51. ATTEMPTS TO SOLVE COMMUNITY PROBLEMS						

4—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A VERY HIGH DEGREE
3—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A HIGH DEGREE
2—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO SOME DEGREE
1—SHOULD BE USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A SMALL DEGREE
0—SHOULD NOT BE EMPHASIZED OR USED AT ALL

	FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS				
	OBSERVATION	PARTICIPATION	STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIENCE AFTER STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH
AS A MEMBER OF THE PROFESSION					
52. DEMONSTRATES AN APPRECIATION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PROFESSION					
53. DEVELOPS AND ADHERES TO A PROFESSIONAL CODE OF ETHICS					
54. CONTRIBUTES TO THE PROFESSION THROUGH ITS ORGANIZATIONS					
55. PARTICIPATES EFFECTIVELY AS A MEMBER OF A PANEL OR DISCUSSION GROUP					
56. SPEAKS EFFECTIVELY TO FORMAL OR INFORMAL AUDIENCES					
57. RECOGNIZES SOURCES OF COMMUNITY CONCERN ABOUT SCHOOL PROBLEMS					

EXHIBIT B

QUESTIONNAIRE TO LABORATORY SCHOOLS

EXHIBIT B

Instrument Sent Laboratory School Directors

To: All Directors of Campus-Connected Schools within the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Subject: Rating of functions of campus-connected schools.

The College of Education and the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School of the University of Florida are sponsoring a study regarding laboratory experiences in a teacher education program. This is an effort to determine two things: First, how much emphasis in actual practice is being given to functions of campus-connected schools to develop certain teacher competencies. Second, to try to secure patterns of functions of campus-connected schools and to identify factors that determine, or contribute to the use of, their primary function.

A review of literature reveals that campus-connected schools generally have five main functions, all of which are used or emphasized to varying degrees. From the literature on teacher competencies a list of 57 of those most commonly found were selected and are being used in this study.

We know that each function (and its accompanying laboratory experiences) contributes something to the development of certain teacher competencies. By the use of the rating scale we want to determine how much emphasis is being given to them to develop those competencies.

We also know that not all campus-connected schools have the same primary function. We are interested in knowing what you consider your school has as its primary function and why.

A similar questionnaire is being sent to a jury of 32 persons who are leaders in the field of teacher education. They will indicate the amount or degree of emphasis that SHOULD be placed on each function to develop those competencies. The results from the campus-connected schools and from the jury will be treated statistically and will result in a comparison of practice and theory.

We realize, of course, how very busy you are with many other duties and responsibilities but we would deeply appreciate your filling out the attached questionnaire and returning it by April 11. A self-addressed

STAMPED ENVELOPE IS ENCLOSED FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE AND MAY BE RETURNED TO CAREY T. SOUTHALL, P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL, GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA.

VERY TRULY YOURS,

E. A. DAVIS, DIRECTOR
P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL

CAREY T. SOUTHALL
RESEARCH ASSISTANT

NAME OF COLLEGE—
LOCATION—
NAME OF CAMPUS SCHOOL—
GRADES IN SCHOOL—
ENROLLMENT—
NUMBER OF TEACHERS—

DEFINITIONS OF FUNCTIONS:

OBSERVATION IS THAT PHASE OF THE LABORATORY EXPERIENCES OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS IN WHICH, UNDER DIRECTION, HE STUDIES PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES IN TEACHING AND MANAGING A CLASS, OR IT MIGHT BE OBSERVING CHILDREN PER SE. THIS INCLUDES OBSERVATION BY CLASSES OR BY INDIVIDUALS.

PARTICIPATION IS THAT PHASE OF LABORATORY EXPERIENCES IN WHICH THE PROSPECTIVE TEACHER, UNDER DIRECTION, HAS LIMITED CONTACT WITH PUPILS IN A CLASS BUT DOES NOT ASSUME FULL RESPONSIBILITY.

STUDENT-TEACHING OR INTERNSHIP IS THAT PERIOD OF GUIDED TEACHING WHEN THE STUDENT TAKES AN INCREASING RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE WORK WITH A GROUP OF LEARNERS OVER A PERIOD OF CONSECUTIVE WEEKS.

EXPERIENCES FOLLOWING STUDENT-TEACHING ARE THOSE EXPERIENCES THAT MIGHT COME IN THE FORM OF SEMINARS, MORE OBSERVATION, FOLLOW-UP STUDIES, PROFESSIONAL COURSES, PARTICIPATION IN SPECIAL PROJECTS OR ACTIVITIES, ETC.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION: CAREFUL AND UNBIASED INVESTIGATION IN WHICH THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD IS INVOLVED, BASED INSOFAR AS POSSIBLE UPON DEMONSTRABLE FACTS AND INVOLVING REFINED DISTINCTIONS, INTERPRETATIONS AND USUALLY SOME GENERALIZATIONS.

WHICH OF THE ABOVE DO YOU CONSIDER YOUR SCHOOL HAS AS ITS PRIMARY FUNCTION?_____.

PLEASE LIST THE FACTORS THAT DETERMINE, OR CONTRIBUTE, TO THE USE OF EMPHASIS OF THIS FUNCTION AND EXPLAIN BRIEFLY.

4—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A VERY HIGH DEGREE
3—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A HIGH DEGREE
2—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO SOME DEGREE
1—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A SMALL DEGREE
0—IS NOT USED OR EMPHASIZED AT ALL

TEACHER COMPETENCIES	FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS				
	OBSERVATION	PARTICIPATION	STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH
AS A DIRECTOR OF LEARNING					
1. PROVIDES A VARIETY OF LEARNING EXPERIENCES WHICH POSSESS MEANING FOR THE PUPIL					
2. APPEALS TO PUPIL INTEREST					
3. PROVIDES EFFECTIVE REVIEW PROCEDURE					
4. KNOWS HOME AND COMMUNITY INFLUENCES ON LEARNING ACTIVITIES					
5. HAS WORKING KNOWLEDGE OF PUPIL PHYSICAL HEALTH PROBLEMS					
6. PROVIDES FOR INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES					
7. PLANS COOPERATIVELY WITH PUPILS IN CLASSROOM					
8. WORKS WITH PUPILS IN A WAY TO BRING OUT LEADERSHIP					
9. ENCOURAGES DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURE IN CLASSROOM					
10. STIMULATES WIDE PARTICIPATION OF PUPILS IN CLASSROOM AT VARIOUS LEVLES OF ABILITY					
11. PROVIDES OPPORTUNITY TO DEVELOP ATTITUDES DEEMED SOCIALLY AND PSYCHOLOGICALLY DESIRABLE					

4—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A VERY HIGH DEGREE
3—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A HIGH DEGREE
2—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO SOME DEGREE
1—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A SMALL DEGREE
0—IS NOT USED OR EMPHASIZED AT ALL

	FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS				
	OBSERVATION	PARTICIPATION	STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT-TEACHING	EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH
12. USED APPROPRIATE TECHNIQUES IN DISCUSSION AND PRESENTATION TECHNIQUES					
13. STIMULATES INDIVIDUAL INTERESTS AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY					
14. DEVELOPS SELF EVALUATION PROCEDURES IN PUPILS					
15. HELPS PUPILS SET UP ACCEPTABLE GOALS IN CLASS					
16. HELPS PUPILS SET UP ACCEPTABLE GOALS OUT OF CLASS					
17. USES AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS EFFECTIVELY IN INSTRUCTION					
18. STUDIES AND USES COMMUNITY RESOURCES					
19. USES RESOURCE PERSONNEL EFFECTIVELY					
20. MANAGES EFFECTIVELY PHYSICAL ASPECTS OF CLASSROOM					
21. DEMONSTRATES THOROUGH PLANNING IN HANDLING MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES					
22. SELECTS EFFECTIVELY, ADMINISTERS AND INTERPRETS DIAGNOSTIC TESTS					
23. EFFECTIVELY USES TEST RESULTS					
24. MAKES APPROPRIATE "TEACHER-MADE" TESTS					
25. MAKES CASE STUDIES, ANECDOTAL RECORDS AND CUMULATIVE FILES					

4—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A VERY HIGH DEGREE
3—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A HIGH DEGREE
2—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO SOME DEGREE
1—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A SMALL DEGREE
0—IS NOT USED OR EMPHASIZED AT ALL

	FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS				
	OBSERVATION	PARTICIPATION	STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH
26. GRADES PUPILS EFFECTIVELY					
27. REPORTS PROGRESS OF PUPILS TO PARENTS EFFECTIVELY					
AS A COUNSELOR AND GUIDANCE WORKER					
28. STUDIES EACH PUPIL'S BACKGROUND					
29. RECOGNIZES SYMPTOMS OF EMOTIONAL MALADJUSTMENT AND ASSISTS IN REMEDIAL PROGRAMS					
30. PROVIDES VOCATIONAL AND AVOCATIONAL GUIDANCE					
31. PROVIDES OPPORTUNITY FOR SUCCESS EXPERIENCE FOR ALL PUPILS					
32. KEEPS RECORDS SUITABLE FOR PERSONAL GUIDANCE					
33. MAINTAINS EFFECTIVE RELATIONSHIP WITH HOMES					
34. DIFFERENTIATES BETWEEN DIRECTIVE AND NON-DIRECTIVE TECHNIQUES IN COUNSELING					
35. RECOGNIZES OWN ABILITIES IN COUNSELING					
36. UNDERSTANDS BASIC PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVE COUNSELING					
AS A MEDIATOR OF THE CULTURE					
37. RELATES SUBJECT MATTER TO SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS					
38. UNDERSTANDS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BROAD FIELDS OF SUBJECT MATTER AS GENERAL EDUCATION					

4—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A VERY HIGH DEGREE
3—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A HIGH DEGREE
2—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO SOME DEGREE
1—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A SMALL DEGREE
0—IS NOT USED OR EMPHASIZED AT ALL

	FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS				
	OBSERVATION	PARTICIPATION	STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH
39. IDENTIFIES KEY PROBLEMS IN SOCIETY AND DEFINES THE ISSUES					
40. DEVELOPS PUPIL-ATTITUDES NECESSARY FOR DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION IN SOCIETY					
41. USES THE COMMITTEE AS A LEARNING EXPERIENCE					
AS A MEMBER OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY					
42. DEMONSTRATES COMPETENCE IN CURRICULUM PLANNING					
43. PLANS COOPERATIVELY FOR EDUCATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE OBJECTIVES					
44. SHARES ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY					
45. WORKS ON SCHOOL EVALUATIVE PROJECTS					
46. PARTICIPATES IN PLANNING AND ADMINISTERING EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES					
47. STARTS WITH SCHOOLS WHERE THEY ARE AND WORKS FOR IMPROVEMENT					
AS A LIAISON BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY					
48. SECURES COOPERATION OF PARENTS IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES					
49. INTERPRETS THE SCHOOL TO THE COMMUNITY AND THE COMMUNITY TO THE PUPILS AND PARENTS					
50. ASSISTS LAY-GROUPS IN DEVELOPING AN UNDERSTANDING OF MODERN EDUCATION					

4—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A VERY HIGH DEGREE
3—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A HIGH DEGREE
2—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO SOME DEGREE
1—IS USED OR EMPHASIZED TO A SMALL DEGREE
0—IS NOT USED OR EMPHASIZED AT ALL

	FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS-CONNECTED SCHOOLS				
	OBSERVATION	PARTICIPATION	STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIENCES AFTER STUDENT TEACHING	EXPERIMENTATION AND RESEARCH
51. ATTEMPTS TO SOLVE COMMUNITY PROBLEMS					
AS A MEMBER OF THE PROFESSION					
52. DEMONSTRATES AN APPRECIATION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PROFESSION					
53. DEVELOPS AND ADHERES TO A PROFESSIONAL CODE OF ETHICS					
54. CONTRIBUTES TO THE PROFESSION THROUGH ITS ORGANIZATION					
55. PARTICIPATES EFFECTIVELY AS A MEMBER OF A PANEL OR DISCUSSION GROUP					
56. SPEAKS EFFECTIVELY TO FORMAL OR INFORMAL AUDIENCES					
57. RECOGNIZES SOURCES OF COMMUNITY CONCERN ABOUT SCHOOL PROBLEMS					

EXHIBIT C

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS HAVING LABORATORY SCHOOLS
PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

EXHIBIT C

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS WITH MEMBERSHIP IN THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION WITH AFFILIATED LABORATORY SCHOOLS THAT PARTICIPATED IN THIS STUDY

Institution	Location
Alabama	
State Teachers College*	Florence
State Teachers College	Troy
Arizona	
Arizona State College	Flagstaff
Arizona State College	Tempe
Arkansas	
Arkansas State Teachers College*	Conway
Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College	Pine Bluff
California	
Chico State College	Chico
University of Southern California	Los Angeles
San Diego State College	San Diego
San Francisco State College*	San Francisco
Colorado	
Colorado State College of Education	Greeley
Western State College of Colorado	Gunnison
Connecticut	
Danbury State Teachers College	Danbury
Willimantic State Teachers College	Willimantic
District of Columbia	
Wilson Teachers College	Washington
Florida	
University of Florida	Gainesville
Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University	Tallahassee
Florida State University	Tallahassee

Institution	Location
Georgia	
Albany State College	Albany
University of Georgia	Athens
Illinois	
Southern Illinois University	Carbondale
Northern Illinois State Teachers College	DeKalb
Western Illinois State College	Macomb
Illinois State Normal University	Normal
Indiana	
Indiana University	Bloomington
Indiana State Teachers College	Terre Haute
Iowa	
Iowa State Teachers College	Cedar Falls
State University of Iowa	Iowa City
Kansas	
Kansas State Teachers College*	Emporia
Kansas State Teachers College	Pittsburg
Kentucky	
Western Kentucky State College	Bowling Green
University of Kentucky	Lexington
Morehead State College	Morehead
Louisiana	
Louisiana State University A & M College	Baton Rouge
Southeastern Louisiana College	Hammond
Southwestern Louisiana Institute	Lafayette
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute	Ruston
Maryland	
State Teachers College	Bowie
State Teachers College	Frostburg
Massachusetts	
State Teachers College	Bridgewater
State Teachers College*	Fitchburg
State Teachers College	North Adams
State Teachers College	Salem

Institution	Location
Michigan	
Northern Michigan College of Education	Marquette
Central Michigan College of Education	Mt. Pleasant
Minnesota	
Mankato State Teachers College	Mankato
University of Minnesota	Minneapolis
St. Cloud State Teachers College*	St. Cloud
Winona State Teachers College	Winona
Mississippi	
Delta State Teachers College	Cleveland
Mississippi Southern College	Hattiesburg
University of Mississippi*	University
Missouri	
Southeast Missouri State College	Cape Girardeau
Northwest Missouri State College	Maryville
Southwest Missouri State College*	Springfield
Central Missouri State College	Warrensburg
Montana	
Eastern Montana College of Education	Billings
Nebraska	
Nebraska State Teachers College*	Chadron
New Hampshire	
Plymouth Teachers College	Plymouth
New Jersey	
New Jersey State Teachers College	Glassboro
New Jersey State Teachers College	Montclair
New Mexico	
New Mexico Western College	Silver City
New York	
State College for Teachers	Buffalo
State Teachers College	Fredonia
State Teachers College	New Paltz

Institution	Location
State Teachers College	Geneseo
State Teachers College	Oneonta
State Teachers College	Plattsburgh
North Carolina	
Appalachian State Teachers College	Boone
Western Carolina College	Cullowhee
Fayetteville State Teachers College	Fayetteville
East Carolina College	Greenville
North Dakota	
State Teachers College	Dickinson
Ohio	
Ohio University	Athens
The Ohio State University	Columbus
Miami University	Oxford
Central State College	Wilberforce
Oklahoma	
East Central State College	Ada
Central State College	Edmond
University of Oklahoma	Norman
Oregon	
Eastern Oregon College of Education	La Grande
Oregon College of Education	Monmouth
Pennsylvania	
State Teachers College	Bloomsburg
State Teachers College	East Stroudsburg
State Teachers College	Edinboro
State Teachers College	Kutztown
State Teachers College	Lock Haven
State Teachers College	Mansfield
State Teachers College	Millersville
University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia
University of Pittsburg	Pittsburgh
State Teachers College	Shippensburg
State Teachers College	West Chester

Institution	Location
Rhode Island	
Rhode Island College of Education	Providence
South Dakota	
General Beadle State Teachers College	Madison
Black Hills Teachers College	Spearfish
Tennessee	
East Tennessee State College*	Johnson City
Texas	
North Texas State College*	Denton
Prairie View Agricultural & Mechanical College	Praire View
Southwest Texas State Teachers College	San Marcos
Utah	
Brigham Young University*	Provo
Virginia	
Radford College	Radford
Washington	
Western Washington College of Education	Bellingham
Eastern Washington College of Education	Cheney
Central Washington College of Education	Ellensburg
West Virginia	
Marshall College	Huntington
Wisconsin	
Wisconsin State College	Eau Claire
Wisconsin State College	La Crosse
University of Wisconsin	Madison
Alverno College	Milwaukee
Wisconsin State College	Oshkosh
Wisconsin State College	River Falls
Wisconsin State College	Superior
Wisconsin State College	Whitewater
Wyoming	
University of Wyoming	Laramie

*Was not received in time for results to be calculated in Exhibit F.

EXHIBIT D

LIST OF JUROR LEADERS WHO ASSISTED IN THE STUDY

EXHIBIT D

THE JURY OF TEACHER EDUCATORS

1. ALEXANDER, WILLIAM., PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, MIAMI UNIVERSITY, CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA.

2. ANDREWS, L. O., DIRECTOR, LABORATORY EXPERIENCES, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

3. ARMENTROUT, W. D., DEAN, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, COLORADO STATE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, GREELEY, COLORADO.

4. ARMSTRONG, W. EARL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

5. BARR, ALVIN S., PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, WISCONSIN.

6. BOTNER, TAFT B., DIRECTOR OF STUDENT TEACHING, WESTERN CAROLINA COLLEGE, CULLOWHEE, NORTH CAROLINA.

7. BURTON, WILLIAM H., DIRECTOR OF APPRENTICE TEACHING, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS.

8. CLARKE, CHARLES, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF TEACHER EDUCATION, ARKANSAS STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS.

9. CARRINGTON, JOHN W., DIRECTOR, LABORATORY EXPERIENCES, ILLINOIS STATE NORMAL UNIVERSITY, NORMAL, ILLINOIS.

10. DUTTON, W. H., ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF STUDENT TEACHING, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA.

11. EYE, GLEN H., DIRECTOR OF STUDENT TEACHING, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, WISCONSIN.

12. FAWCETT, HAROLD, PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

13. GINGER, LYMAN V., PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY.

14. GRUHN, WILLIAM T., DIRECTOR, TEACHER EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, STORRS, CONNECTICUT.

15. Haskew, L. D., Dean, College of Education, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

16. Heilbronn, E., Supervisor of Laboratory Experiences, Central Michigan College of Education, Mount Pleasant, Michigan.

17. Hockett, John A., Director of Student Teaching, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.

18. Jaggers, Richard E., Professor of Elementary Education, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

19. McCusky, Dorothy, Director of Laboratory Experiences, Western Kentucky State College, Bowling Green, Kentucky.

20. McGeoch, Dorothy, Professor of Education, Emory University, Emory University, Georgia.

21. McCall, William A., Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, New York.

22. Ohlsen, Merle, Director, Teacher Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

23. Mead, Arthur R., Professor Emeritus, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

24. Robert, E. B., Dean, College of Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

25. Rugg, Earle, Professor of Education, Colorado State College of Education, Greeley, Colorado.

26. Richey, R., Director, Elementary Student Teaching, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

27. Romine, Stephen, Professor of Education, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

28. Sharpe, Donald, Director, Secondary Laboratory Experiences, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

29. Stiles, Lindley, Dean, College of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.

30. Stratemeyer, Florence, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, New York.

31. Tanruther, E. M., Director, Elementary Laboratory Experiences, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

32. TRABUE, MARION R., DEAN, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE, STATE COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA.

EXHIBIT E

STATED REASONS OF 115 LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS
FOR PRIMARY EMPHASIS OF THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS

EXHIBIT E

STATED REASONS OF 115 CAMPUS SCHOOL
DIRECTORS FOR PRIMARY EMPHASIS
OF THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS

OBSERVATION

LIMITED OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENT TEACHING.

OUR STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM HAS EXPANDED TO THE POINT WHERE WE CAN'T TAKE CARE OF THEM IN THE LAB SCHOOL.

WE FOUND THAT WE COULD NOT HANDLE OBSERVERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS DUE TO THE INCREASED NUMBER OF THE LATTER.

WE HAVE DROPPED STUDENT TEACHING DUE TO AN OVERLOAD AND THIS HAS HELPED US CONCENTRATE ON OBSERVATION.

WE HAVE HAD TO GIVE UP STUDENT TEACHING AS OUR NUMBER ONE FUNCTION DUE TO LIMITED FACILITIES AND TURN TO MORE EMPHASIS ON OBSERVATION.

BECAUSE OUR FACILITIES FOR STUDENT TEACHING ARE LIMITED.

EXPANSION OF OUR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM HAS CAUSED US TO DROP STUDENT TEACHING AND AS A RESULT WE HAVE PUT MORE EMPHASIS ON OBSERVATION

DUE TO INCREASE IN STUDENT POPULATION OF OUR COLLEGE, IT HAS BECOME IMPOSSIBLE TO ACCOMODATE ALL OUR STUDENT TEACHERS.

WE EMPHASIZE OBSERVATION HERE BECAUSE WE DO NO STUDENT TEACHING IN THE LABORATORY SCHOOL.

AS MANY OTHER SCHOOLS THAT ARE EXPANDING THEIR TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM ARE DOING, MORE STUDENT TEACHING IS BEING DONE OFF-CAMPUS. WE ARE DOING THE SAME AND AS A RESULT WE ARE TAKING ON OBSERVATION AS OUR MOST IMPORTANT FUNCTION.

IF THE SCHOOL WERE LARGE ENOUGH THE PRIMARY FUNCTION WOULD NO DOUBT BE STUDENT TEACHING, BUT WE CAN GIVE ONLY A FRACTION OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS EXPERIENCES IN OUR SCHOOL.

WE THINK THIS IS AN EFFECTIVE WAY TO BEGIN STUDYING CHILDREN.

IT IS BECAUSE WE FEEL SO STRONGLY THAT OUR PRIMARY FUNCTION SHOULD BE OBSERVATION THAT WE DO NOT USE OUR SCHOOL FOR STUDENT TEACHING. AS SOON AS STUDENT TEACHING IS INTRODUCED, ONE OF TWO THINGS HAPPEN: (1) THE STUDENTS DO NOT SEE IDEAL TEACHING AT ALL TIMES, OR (2) THE STUDENT TEACHER GETS VERY LITTLE TIME TO ACTUALLY TEACH BECAUSE THE TEACHER FEELS SHE FEELS SHE MUST TAKE OVER BECAUSE OF THE OBSERVERS.

PHILOSOPHY OF OUR SCHOOL PLUS EXCELLENT SUPERVISORS.

THIS IS THE PLACE WHEREIN THE PROSPECTIVE TEACHER CAN BEGIN TO LEARN WHAT TEACHING IS ALL ABOUT EARLY IN THE PROGRAM.

IT IS NECESSARY TO PREPARE FOR THEIR PRACTICE TEACHING.

WE BELIEVE THAT PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS CAN LEARN MUCH FROM SEEING GOOD TEACHING.

WE WANT TO INTRODUCE THEM TO TEACHING THROUGH OBSERVATION UNDER OUR CLOSE SUPERVISION.

IT PROVIDES AN OPPORTUNITY TO SEE HOW TEACHERS WORK WITH CHILDREN.

TO DEMONSTRATE THE PRINCIPLES OF LEARNING IN ACTION.

OBSERVATION EXEMPLIFIES METHODS INSTRUCTION.

OUR CAMPUS SCHOOL IS THE MOST CONVENIENT PLACE FOR UNDERGRADUATES IN EDUCATION TO OBSERVE CHILDREN IN AN ENVIRONMENT SIMILAR TO THE ONES THEY ARE DISCUSSING AND READING ABOUT IN THEIR COURSE WORK.

BECAUSE WE HAVE JUST MOVED OUT OF STUDENT TEACHING INTO AN EXPANDED PROGRAM OF OBSERVATION WHICH WE CAN MORE ADEQUATELY HANDLE IN OUR PLANT.

PHYSICAL PLANT AND ARRANGMENTS ARE CONDUCIVE TO OBSERVATION. ADDING PARTICIPATION GRADUALLY.

IT IS TOO INCONVENIENT TO OBSERVE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

CONVENIENT ACCESSIBILITY TO CLASSES TO OBSERVE.

THIS FUNCTION IS IN KEEPING WITH THE PURPOSE OF OUR COLLEGE.

TRADITION AND LACK OF LEADERSHIP—MOVING IN DIRECTION OF INCREASED PARTICIPATION.

IT CAN BE EASILY INTEGRATED WITH PROFESSIONAL COURSES.

IT IS AN EASILY INTEGRATED PHASE OF OUR PROGRAM SINCE OUR EDUCATION DEPARTMENT AND LABORATORY SCHOOL ARE IN THE SAME BUILDING.

Observation and Participation

After doing a trial run with participants, the supervising teachers in the field reported that the student teachers who had been participants did a better job and adjusted more quickly to student teaching than did the student teachers who had not been participants.

Since most observation takes place during the freshman and sophomore years and student teaching the senior year, participation provides laboratory experiences during the junior year thereby giving contact with children all four years.

Observation and participation provide an opportunity for students to see pupils plan together, how children are guided by means of the positive approach, how and what to routinize and how to care for individual differences.

The program we offer gives the prospective teacher an opportunity to see how worthwhile objectives are set up and achieved.

Seeing good teaching in action in a lab school under close supervision as a participant lays the foundation to a prospective teacher's training.

Due to the philosophy of our school.

Observation formerly was our primary function but now we have added participation and have given it equal footing with observation.

Seeing good teaching and then having a chance to participate in a role other than a student teacher is good pre-teaching experience.

We formerly had observation and student teaching as our main functions but our program of student teaching has grown so large that we recently dropped student teaching and have added participation which we can handle more adequately.

Observation and participation is easier to schedule in our building than observation and student teaching. Too, student teaching is now done off-campus.

Since our student teaching program was getting so large, we started "farming our" our student teachers to public schools and directed more attention to observation and participation.

Because we found it difficult to handle student teaching with observation and participation with our present facilities.

BECAUSE OF THE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF OUR CRITIC TEACHERS.

WE HAVE MASTER TEACHERS TO OBSERVE.

ACCESSIBILITY OF CLASSES TO OBSERVE.

FACILITIES FOR OBSERVATION AND PARTICIPATION.

WE HAVE RECENTLY DROPPED STUDENT TEACHING AND ADDED PARTICIPATION. SINCE STUDENT TEACHING IS NOW DONE OFF-CAMPUS WE THINK PARTICIPATION SERVES AS A PROFESSIONALIZED TRANSITION INTO STUDENT TEACHING.

WE THINK A COMBINATION OF OBSERVATION AND PARTICIPATION SERVES AS A GOOD INDUCTION INTO STUDENT TEACHING.

Participation

Limited space for student teaching.

Because we have fewer participants and our facilities are limited.

School too small to accomodate all student teachers.

Inadequacy of school in terms of number in class; that is, in many departments there are too many college students and too few high school classes for student teaching so we now have an extensive program of participation.

Our school is too small for observation and the fact that we now have an off-campus internship program participation is now our most important function.

Moving of student teaching out of laboratory school which was replaced with participation.

Feeling on part of College of Education, in part, that participation was valuable to good teacher education.

Pre-student teaching experiences is valuable before getting feet wet.

Participation is a place that allows us to counsel prospective teachers in light of their strength and weaknesses.

It helps us in evaluating our program leading up to student teaching.

Emphasis can be placed on study of individuals rather than on methods.

The participant can be studied in laboratory school before he becomes preoccupied with other things in student teaching.

Participation helps us induct student teachers into student teaching gradually.

We feel that participation is a necessary step in the orientation of college students to student teaching.

Student Teaching

Student teaching is probably the most real life professional experience with which the student is provided before actually accepting and undertaking the responsibilities of a full-time teaching position in the public schools.

It is an integrative experience for students—it provides them an opportunity to piece together in a real teaching situation, all their preceding professional knowledge, attitudes and experience.

It provides the most valid situations possible prior to graduation for the student and his supervisor to assess his ability to work with children.

We feel that the internship is our most important function because it is the period of a future teacher's training which causes all previous training to take on added meaning and significance and results in the formation of good professional practices.

We believe not only that more situations are presented in student-teaching for developing desired competencies in prospective teachers than in any other single type preparatory experience, but also that the factors involved in the student-teaching experience are more conducive to the successful development of those desired competencies than are the factors of any other single type of preparatory experience.

Philosophy of school.

This is the very heart of learning how to teach.

We believe the principal factors involved in successful student-teaching may be more effectively controlled in our laboratory school than in an off-campus school.

It is the best induction into actual teaching experiences.

Basic organization of school.

Because of the importance of the performance element.

Think that practice teaching is the apex of their training experiences.

A philosophy of our faculty believes the heart of the teacher preparation program is the student-teaching assignment.

Student-teaching is most fundamental.

A lab school makes possible an integrative program of learning experience during the four years a student is with us.

THIS PROVIDES AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE STUDENT TO LEARN IN A PRACTICAL WAY THOSE SKILLS AND CONCEPTS ESSENTIAL TO SUCCESS IN TEACHING.

BECAUSE OUR ENROLLMENT IS DRAWN FROM A REGULAR SCHOOL DISTRICT AND REPRESENTS A CROSS-SECTION OF POPULATION FROM SOCIO-ECONOMIC STANDPOINT.

PHILOSOPHY.

GOING TO INTEGRATE PARTICIPATION WITH STUDENT TEACHING.

STUDENT TEACHING IS A CLIMAX OF PREPARATION.

GOING TO DROP STUDENT TEACHING AND CONCENTRATE ON OBSERVATION.

MOST IMPORTANT PART OF A PROSPECTIVE TEACHER'S TRAINING.

SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY.

WE FEEL THAT OUR FIRST DUTY TO OUR EDUCATION MAJORS IS TO OFFER THEM DIRECTED, RESPONSIBLE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES.

HERE HE LEARNS TO MAKE USE OF ALL THE THINGS HE HAS LEARNED IN PRECEDING PROFESSIONAL COURSES.

HERE HE LEARNS TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR HANDLING A CLASS.

IT MAKES A PROFESSIONAL CENTER FOR ALL PROFESSIONAL WORK.

WE ACCEPT STUDENT TEACHING AS THE MOST IMPORTANT SINGLE ACTIVITY IN THE PREPARATION OF A TEACHER.

WE THINK OF STUDENT TEACHING AS THE CLIMAX OR THE CULMINATION OF OUR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM.

WE HAVE NOT GROWN SO LARGE THAT WE CANNOT DO OUR OWN STUDENT TEACHING IN THE LAB SCHOOL.

IF WE "FARMED-OUT" OUR STUDENT TEACHERS IT WOULD RUN OUR PER CAPITA COSTS FAR BEYOND OUR RESOURCES.

LOCATION ON CAMPUS.

BEING ON THE CAMPUS, THE LAB SCHOOL IS READILY ACCESSIBLE.

LOCATION OF SCHOOL.

ADEQUATE PLANT.

BUILDING IS DIRECTLY ATTACHED TO COLLEGE OF EDUCATION BUILDING.

SPACE AND FACILITIES.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES.

A CONVENIENT PLACE TO TRAIN TEACHERS.

WE CAN STILL TAKE CARE OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN OUR PRESENT BUILDING.

BECAUSE PROBABLY NEVER AGAIN WILL THE STUDENT HAVE THE CONSTANT, COMPETENT SUPERVISION AND ASSISTANCE READILY AVAILABLE TO HIM IN HIS STUDENT-TEACHING CAPACITY.

WE HAVE ESPECIALLY QUALIFIED SUPERVISORS TO GUIDE THE STUDENT-TEACHERS.

BELIEF IN CLOSE SUPERVISION THAT STUDENT-TEACHING IN LAB SCHOOL PROVIDES.

OUR STAFF IS SPECIFICALLY TRAINED FOR THE SUPERVISION OF STUDENT-TEACHERS.

QUALIFICATIONS OF SUPERVISORS.

SUPERIOR SUPERVISORS.

ORIGINALLY INTENDED FOR THAT PURPOSE.

OUR BUILDING WAS DESIGNED WITH THIS FUNCTION IN MIND.

IT REVEALS TO US, NOT ONLY THE STUDENT'S ACTUAL STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES, BUT OUR OWN AS WELL.

ON THE BASIS OF WHAT HAPPENS DURING THE INTERN PERIOD WE EVALUATE AND MODIFY OUR PROGRAM.

VERY LIMITED OFF-CAMPUS FACILITIES FOR STUDENT-TEACHING NECESSITATES OUR USING THE LABORATORY SCHOOL FOR STUDENT-TEACHING.

OUR EMPHASIS ON STUDENT-TEACHING STEMS FROM OUR GREAT NEED FOR STUDENT TEACHER STATIONS.

WE ANTICIPATE THIS AS THE LAST YEAR OF HAVING STUDENT-TEACHERS.

Experimentation and Research

Many departments of university contribute to our primary function of experimentation and research. We have people from nursing, medicine, psychology, etc. all come in and help us. All projects are coordinated with and under the direction of the laboratory school.

Its location and size makes it the most ideal and desirable center where new ideas can be tried and evaluated.

Now that student teaching is done in the public schools, it will leave us more time to carry out our most important function—that of experimentation and research.

The laboratory school with the ideal physical facilities, small enrollment and superior teachers can make its greatest contribution to prospective teachers if used for experimentation and research.

Educational experimentation is best carried on in the kind of setting that the laboratory school offers.

It is part of the philosophy upon which our laboratory school is based.

It is the most ideal and desirable center where new ideas can be tried and evaluated.

By concentrating our efforts on experimentation and research we can have a substantial impact on education in area which we serve.

The public schools look to us for leadership in the way of research.

EXHIBIT F

MASTER DATA SHEET

MASTER DATA SHEET

THE MEAN RATING AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF FIFTY-SEVEN TEACHER COMPETENCIES FOR FIVE FUNCTIONS AS RATED BY SELECTED LEADERS IN TEACHER EDUCATION, 100 LABORATORY SCHOOL DIRECTORS, AND THE FACULTIES OF THE P. K. YONGE LABORATORY SCHOOL

Competency*	Jury		100 Laboratory School Directors		Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Secondary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School	
	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
					Observation					
1	3.1	1.1	2.9	1.1	2.1	1.4	3.4	1.0	3.1	1.3
2	3.3	1.0	2.8	1.2	3.0	.9	3.2	1.0	3.2	1.0
3	2.3	1.4	2.4	1.2	1.7	1.0	2.4	.4	2.2	1.1
4	2.7	1.2	2.1	1.2	2.6	1.2	3.0	.8	2.9	.9
5	2.6	1.0	2.3	1.2	1.9	1.2	2.8	1.1	2.6	1.2
6	3.3	1.0	2.9	1.1	3.3	.9	2.9	1.2	3.0	1.1
7	2.7	1.2	2.5	1.3	3.4	.7	3.2	1.2	3.2	1.2
8	2.6	1.3	2.4	1.3	3.1	.8	3.0	1.1	3.0	1.0
9	3.0	1.1	2.7	1.3	3.0	.9	3.2	1.1	3.1	1.1
10	3.0	1.0	2.6	1.3	3.0	.9	3.0	1.1	3.0	1.1
11	2.8	1.1	2.5	1.3	2.6	.9	2.8	1.1	2.7	1.0
12	2.7	1.1	2.5	1.4	2.9	1.0	3.2	1.2	3.1	1.2
13	2.8	1.1	2.6	1.4	3.0	1.1	2.8	1.2	2.8	1.2
14	2.6	1.1	2.2	1.3	2.6	.9	2.8	1.2	2.7	1.1
15	2.9	1.1	2.3	1.4	2.0	.9	2.8	1.2	2.6	1.2
16	2.5	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.9	1.2	2.3	1.1	2.2	1.2
17	2.5	1.1	2.3	1.3	3.0	1.1	2.7	1.3	2.7	1.3
18	2.5	1.2	2.1	1.2	2.4	.9	3.0	1.1	2.8	1.1
19	2.4	1.2	1.9	1.2	2.3	.9	2.9	1.3	2.7	1.2
20	2.5	1.1	2.5	1.3	2.4	.7	2.6	1.2	2.5	1.1
21	2.5	1.2	2.4	1.3	2.0	.7	2.7	1.1	2.5	1.1
22	2.2	1.2	1.8	1.4	1.7	1.0	1.8	1.4	1.8	1.3

MASTER DATA SHEET—CONTINUED

Competency*	Jury		100 Laboratory School Directors		Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Secondary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School	
	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
23	2.3	1.2	1.8	1.4	1.9	.8	2.3	1.3	2.2	1.2
24	2.1	1.3	1.8	1.4	1.6	1.0	2.1	1.6	1.9	1.5
25	2.8	1.2	2.2	1.3	3.9	.3	3.1	1.2	3.3	1.1
26	1.9	1.3	1.7	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.8	1.4	1.8	1.4
27	2.2	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.8	1.2	1.8	1.3
28	2.6	1.2	2.1	1.4	3.9	.3	2.9	1.2	3.1	1.2
29	2.7	1.3	1.9	1.2	1.7	.9	2.2	1.5	2.0	1.4
30	1.8	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.0	2.0	1.4	1.8	1.3
31	2.3	1.3	1.9	1.4	2.6	1.8	2.5	1.3	2.5	1.4
32	2.1	1.3	1.8	1.4	3.0	1.1	2.6	1.3	2.7	1.2
33	2.1	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.7	1.5	2.1	1.4	2.0	1.4
34	1.7	1.3	1.2	1.2	2.1	1.6	1.9	1.3	2.0	1.4
35	1.7	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.1	1.0	2.0	1.4	1.7	1.3
36	1.9	1.2	1.6	1.3	1.4	1.2	2.4	1.4	2.1	.4
37	2.3	1.4	2.0	1.3	1.7	1.3	2.6	2.2	2.4	1.5
38	2.3	1.2	2.0	1.3	2.0	1.5	2.7	1.2	2.5	1.3
39	2.3	1.2	1.7	1.1	1.7	1.0	2.5	1.5	2.3	1.5
40	2.3	1.3	2.1	1.4	2.6	1.5	2.5	1.1	2.5	1.2
41	2.1	1.4	2.1	1.5	2.9	1.1	2.4	1.4	2.5	1.3
42	1.8	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	.9	1.7	1.3	1.6	1.3
43	2.1	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.1	1.2	2.0	1.5	1.7	1.5
44	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.2	.6	1.0	1.6	1.6	1.3	1.5
45	1.9	1.3	1.2	1.3	.6	.7	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.5
46	2.1	1.3	1.4	1.3	.9	.8	2.0	1.5	1.7	1.5
47	2.1	1.5	1.7	1.4	.7	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.5	1.3
48	1.9	1.3	1.3	1.3	.9	1.3	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.4
49	2.1	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.3
50	1.6	1.2	1.1	1.2	.1	.3	1.3	1.3	1.0	1.2
51	1.7	1.3	.9	1.0	.3	.5	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.2
52	2.4	1.2	2.0	1.4	1.6	1.7	2.7	1.3	2.4	1.5

MASTER DATA SHEET—CONTINUED

Competency*	Jury		100 Laboratory School Directors		Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Secondary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School	
	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
53	2.5	1.3	2.1	1.5	1.4	1.7	2.5	1.4	2.2	1.5
54	1.9	1.2	1.8	1.5	.7	.9	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.4
55	2.0	1.2	1.7	1.5	2.3	1.6	2.6	1.3	2.5	1.4
56	1.7	1.2	1.5	1.4	.4	.5	2.2	1.2	1.7	1.3
57	2.0	1.2	1.6	1.4	.9	1.5	2.3	1.3	1.9	1.5
					Participation					
1	3.3	.9	2.8	1.1	3.6	.5	2.7	1.0	2.9	.9
2	3.4	.8	2.7	1.1	3.4	.9	2.6	.9	2.8	1.0
3	2.5	1.2	2.4	1.1	2.6	1.2	2.4	.8	2.4	.9
4	3.0	1.0	2.4	1.0	3.4	.7	2.5	1.1	2.7	1.1
5	2.8	.8	2.5	1.1	2.9	1.3	2.3	1.1	2.4	1.2
6	3.6	.7	2.9	1.1	3.6	.7	3.0	.9	3.2	.9
7	3.2	.9	2.7	1.1	3.9	.3	2.8	1.1	3.1	1.0
8	3.0	1.0	2.6	1.1	2.9	1.1	2.9	1.1	2.9	1.1
9	3.3	.8	2.9	1.1	4.0	.0	3.1	.9	3.3	1.1
10	3.2	.8	2.8	1.1	3.1	.3	2.8	1.2	3.1	1.2
11	3.0	.8	2.7	1.1	3.3	.7	3.1	.9	3.2	.8
12	3.1	.9	2.7	1.1	3.4	.7	3.1	.8	3.2	.8
13	3.2	.7	2.8	1.1	3.3	.9	2.8	1.0	2.9	1.0
14	3.1	1.1	2.5	.8	3.6	.5	2.4	1.2	2.7	1.2
15	3.1	1.0	2.5	1.1	3.6	.5	2.7	.9	2.9	.9
16	2.8	1.1	2.2	1.1	2.6	.9	2.1	1.1	2.2	1.1
17	2.9	.9	2.7	1.2	3.4	.7	2.5	1.2	2.7	1.2
18	2.9	.8	2.3	1.1	3.3	.7	2.4	1.3	2.6	1.2
19	2.6	1.0	2.1	1.1	3.1	.8	2.7	.9	2.8	.9
20	3.1	.8	2.7	1.1	3.3	.4	2.4	1.1	2.6	1.1
21	2.9	1.0	2.7	1.2	3.0	.7	2.6	1.1	2.7	1.1
22	2.7	1.0	2.1	1.3	2.4	.9	1.4	1.2	1.7	1.2

MASTER DATA SHEET—CONTINUED

Competency*	Jury		100 Laboratory School Directors		Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Secondary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School	
	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
23	2.8	1.0	2.0	1.3	2.4	.9	2.0	1.2	2.1	1.2
24	2.8	1.2	2.0	1.3	2.6	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.8	1.1
25	3.1	.9	2.3	1.1	3.7	.4	2.2	1.2	2.6	1.3
26	2.4	1.2	1.9	1.4	2.4	1.2	1.7	1.1	1.9	1.2
27	2.5	1.1	1.7	1.4	2.7	1.0	1.6	1.4	1.9	1.4
28	3.1	1.0	2.4	1.2	3.7	.4	2.3	1.4	2.6	1.2
29	2.8	1.0	2.3	1.2	2.9	.3	2.1	1.2	2.3	1.2
30	2.2	1.2	1.5	1.3	2.7	1.4	1.9	1.1	2.1	1.3
31	2.8	1.1	2.3	1.2	3.3	.9	2.4	1.1	2.6	1.1
32	2.7	1.1	2.0	1.3	3.0	1.3	1.9	1.3	2.2	1.3
33	2.3	1.3	1.7	1.4	2.0	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.3
34	2.0	1.3	1.4	1.2	2.1	1.6	1.9	1.4	1.9	.4
35	2.2	1.3	1.7	1.2	2.0	.9	1.9	1.5	1.9	1.3
36	2.4	1.2	1.9	1.1	1.9	1.3	2.0	1.5	1.9	1.5
37	3.0	1.9	2.3	1.2	2.9	.6	2.4	1.3	2.4	1.2
38	2.8	1.0	2.2	1.1	2.9	1.2	2.4	1.1	2.5	1.1
39	2.3	1.0	1.8	1.2	2.6	.7	2.2	1.4	2.3	1.3
40	2.0	1.0	2.4	1.2	3.4	.5	2.5	1.2	2.7	1.2
41	2.5	1.1	2.5	1.2	3.7	.7	2.5	1.1	2.8	1.1
42	2.3	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.7	1.5	1.7	1.1	1.7	1.2
43	2.4	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.6	1.4	1.8	1.4	1.7	1.4
44	1.9	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.4
45	2.3	1.1	1.4	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.3	1.8	1.3	1.3
46	2.8	1.0	1.8	1.3	2.3	.9	1.9	1.4	2.0	1.3
47	2.3	1.3	1.8	1.3	1.3	1.6	1.6	1.1	1.5	1.3
48	2.2	1.1	1.6	1.3	2.3	1.0	1.5	1.4	1.7	1.3
49	2.3	1.1	1.5	1.3	1.7	1.2	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.3
50	1.9	1.2	1.3	1.3	.4	.7	1.4	1.3	1.1	1.3
51	1.8	1.3	1.0	1.0	.9	.8	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.1
52	2.8	1.1	2.1	1.4	2.0	1.6	2.4	1.3	2.3	1.4

MASTER DATA SHEET—CONTINUED

Competency*	Jury		100 Laboratory School Directors		Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Secondary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School	
	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
53	3.0	1.2	2.3	1.4	2.1	1.4	2.5	1.3	2.4	1.3
54	2.5	1.8	1.8	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.6	1.4	1.5	1.3
55	2.4	1.0	1.9	1.4	2.7	1.6	2.4	1.2	2.4	1.3
56	2.5	1.2	1.7	1.4	1.6	.9	2.3	1.2	2.1	1.2
57	2.5	1.1	1.7	1.3	1.7	1.3	1.9	1.4	1.8	1.4
					Student Teaching					
1	3.5	1.1	3.7	.8	*	*	2.6	1.2	2.6	1.2
2	3.5	1.1	3.6	.9			2.7	1.1	2.7	1.1
3	3.1	1.2	3.3	1.1			2.6	1.2	2.6	1.2
4	3.1	1.2	3.3	.9			2.9	1.1	2.9	1.1
5	3.2	1.2	3.4	.9			2.9	1.1	2.9	1.1
6	3.5	1.1	3.6	.8			3.2	1.1	3.2	1.1
7	3.5	1.1	3.6	.8			3.2	1.1	3.2	1.0
8	3.3	1.2	3.5	.9			3.2	1.1	3.2	1.1
9	3.4	1.2	3.7	.8			3.2	1.1	3.2	1.1
10	3.4	1.2	3.6	.8			3.1	1.1	3.1	1.1
11	3.3	1.2	3.6	.8			3.1	1.0	3.1	1.0
12	3.4	1.2	3.5	.9			3.2	1.1	3.2	1.1
13	3.4	1.1	3.6	.8			3.0	1.0	3.0	1.0
14	3.3	1.1	3.4	.9			3.0	1.0	3.0	1.0
15	3.4	1.1	3.5	.9			3.1	1.1	3.1	1.1
16	3.2	1.2	2.9	1.1			2.5	1.1	2.5	1.1
17	3.2	1.2	3.5	.9			3.1	1.0	3.1	1.0
18	3.1	1.1	3.2	.9			3.0	1.1	3.0	1.1
19	3.0	1.2	3.1	1.0			3.0	1.1	3.0	1.1
20	3.1	1.1	3.5	.8			2.9	1.1	2.9	1.1
21	3.3	1.2	3.5	.9			3.0	1.1	3.0	1.1
22	3.1	1.2	2.9	1.0			2.3	1.2	2.3	1.2

MASTER DATA SHEET—CONTINUED

Competency*	Jury		100 Laboratory School Directors		Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Secondary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School	
	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
23	3.4	1.2	3.2	1.0			2.6	1.0	2.6	1.0
24	3.4	1.2	3.3	.9			2.8	1.1	2.8	1.1
25	3.1	1.2	3.1	1.0			2.8	1.0	2.8	1.0
26	3.3	1.3	3.3	1.1			2.8	1.4	2.8	1.4
27	3.0	1.3	3.1	1.2			2.4	1.2	2.4	1.2
28	3.3	1.2	3.2	1.1			2.9	1.1	2.9	1.1
29	3.2	1.2	3.2	1.0			2.6	1.1	2.6	1.1
30	2.6	1.2	2.3	1.2			2.4	1.1	2.4	1.1
31	3.3	1.2	3.2	1.0			2.9	1.0	2.9	1.0
32	3.2	1.1	3.1	1.1			2.6	1.2	2.6	1.2
33	2.8	1.2	2.9	1.1			2.2	1.2	2.2	1.2
34	2.5	1.3	2.2	1.3			2.3	1.4	2.3	1.4
35	2.9	1.1	2.7	1.1			2.5	1.2	2.5	1.2
36	3.0	1.2	2.8	1.1			2.4	1.3	2.4	1.3
37	3.3	1.2	3.3	.9			2.9	1.2	2.9	1.2
38	2.9	1.2	3.1	1.0			2.8	1.0	2.8	1.0
39	3.6	1.1	2.6	1.0			2.6	1.2	2.6	1.2
40	3.4	1.1	3.4	.9			3.1	1.0	3.1	1.0
41	3.1	1.2	3.3	1.0			2.9	1.1	2.9	1.1
42	2.8	1.2	2.7	1.2			2.6	1.2	2.6	1.2
43	3.0	1.3	2.9	1.1			2.8	1.2	2.8	1.2
44	2.4	1.3	2.5	1.2			2.2	1.5	2.2	1.5
45	2.6	1.3	2.4	1.2			2.3	1.4	2.3	1.4
46	3.0	1.1	2.5	1.2			2.6	1.3	2.6	1.3
47	2.8	1.3	2.7	1.2			2.2	1.3	2.2	1.3
48	2.8	1.3	2.7	1.2			1.9	1.5	1.9	1.5
49	2.7	1.2	2.7	1.2			2.1	1.6	2.1	1.6
50	2.2	1.4	2.2	1.2			1.9	1.3	1.9	1.3
51	1.8	1.2	2.0	1.4			1.8	1.4	1.8	1.4
52	3.3	1.1	3.1	1.2			2.8	1.2	2.8	1.2

MASTER DATA SHEET—CONTINUED

Competency*	Jury		100 Laboratory School Directors		Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Secondary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School	
	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
53	3.4	1.0	3.1	1.3			2.6	1.2	2.6	1.2
54	2.8	1.2	2.5	1.2			2.1	1.4	2.1	1.4
55	2.8	1.2	2.5	1.2			2.6	1.1	2.6	1.1
56	2.5	1.3	2.6	1.2			2.5	1.3	2.5	1.3
57	2.7	1.2	2.8	1.4			2.3	1.5	2.3	1.5

*There were no elementary student teachers in P. K. Yonge Laboratory School during 1954–1955.

Experiences After Student Teaching

1	2.8	1.0	1.3	1.2	.4	.5	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.3
2	2.6	1.0	1.2	1.3	.4	.5	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.2
3	2.3	1.1	1.2	1.3	.4	.7	1.1	1.2	.9	1.1
4	2.6	1.0	1.1	1.3	.3	.7	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.3
5	2.4	1.2	1.1	1.3	.7	.9	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.3
6	2.9	1.1	1.4	1.4	.9	.8	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.4
7	2.7	1.1	1.1	1.3	.9	.8	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.2
8	2.4	1.0	1.2	1.3	.7	.7	1.0	1.1	.9	1.0
9	2.9	1.0	1.2	1.3	.7	.5	1.1	1.4	1.0	1.2
10	2.6	1.0	1.2	1.3	.3	.5	1.2	1.4	.9	1.3
11	2.9	1.0	1.2	1.3	.4	.5	1.1	1.2	.9	1.1
12	2.7	1.1	1.1	1.3	.3	.5	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.2
13	2.9	1.0	1.2	1.3	.4	.5	1.1	1.3	.9	1.2
14	3.0	.9	1.1	1.2	.6	.7	1.4	1.6	1.2	1.4
15	2.8	1.0	1.1	1.3	.4	.7	1.3	1.4	1.0	1.3
16	2.6	1.2	.9	1.2	.4	.5	1.0	1.2	.8	1.1
17	2.4	1.0	1.3	1.4	.6	1.0	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.4

MASTER DATA SHEET—CONTINUED

Competency*	Jury		100 Laboratory School Directors		Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Secondary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School	
	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
18	2.8	1.0	1.1	1.2	.6	1.0	1.3	1.4	1.1	1.4
19	2.8	1.1	1.2	1.3	.3	.4	1.3	1.5	1.0	1.4
20	2.1	1.3	1.1	1.3	.3	.4	1.1	1.4	.9	1.3
21	2.4	1.4	1.2	1.3	.4	.7	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.3
22	3.0	1.0	1.3	1.3	.4	.5	.9	1.3	.8	1.2
23	2.7	1.4	1.3	1.4	.4	.7	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.4
24	2.5	1.3	1.2	1.4	.3	.4	1.1	1.4	.9	1.3
25	2.8	1.2	1.2	1.4	.6	.7	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.3
26	2.4	1.2	1.0	1.3	.3	.4	1.1	1.5	.9	1.4
27	2.4	1.0	1.1	1.4	.3	.4	1.0	1.4	.8	1.2
28	2.7	1.2	1.0	1.3	.3	.4	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.4
29	2.9	1.2	1.1	1.3	.3	.4	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.3
30	2.3	1.3	.9	1.3	.3	.4	1.2	1.4	.9	1.3
31	2.7	1.2	1.0	1.3	.3	.4	1.1	1.3	.9	1.2
32	2.6	1.2	1.1	1.3	.6	1.0	1.1	1.4	1.0	1.3
33	2.7	1.1	.9	1.2	.3	.4	1.0	1.4	.8	1.3
34	2.5	1.1	.9	1.3	.3	.4	1.0	1.4	.8	1.2
35	2.8	1.2	1.1	1.3	.6	.7	1.3	1.5	1.1	1.4
36	3.0	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.1	1.4	1.1	1.5	1.1	1.4
37	3.0	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.5
38	3.2	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.7	1.7	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.4
39	3.1	.9	1.1	1.3	.4	.5	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.3
40	3.1	1.0	1.1	1.2	.6	.5	1.0	1.2	.9	1.1
41	2.8	1.0	1.1	1.3	.9	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.4
42	3.3	.8	1.3	1.4	.6	.7	1.3	1.6	1.1	1.5
43	2.9	1.0	1.2	1.4	.7	1.0	1.1	1.5	1.0	1.4
44	2.1	1.1	1.0	1.2	.3	.5	1.1	1.6	.9	1.5
45	2.6	1.1	1.1	1.3	.3	.5	1.1	1.5	.9	1.4
46	2.8	1.0	1.1	1.3	.6	1.0	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.4
47	2.8	1.2	1.3	1.4	.4	.7	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.3
48	2.8	1.2	1.1	1.3	.3	.5	1.1	1.5	.9	1.4
49	2.9	1.1	1.1	1.3	.4	.7	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.3

MASTER DATA SHEET—CONTINUED

Competency*	Jury		100 Laboratory School Directors		Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Secondary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School	
	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
50	2.5	1.2	1.0	1.2	.4	.7	.9	1.2	.8	1.1
51	2.4	1.2	.9	1.1	.7	.9	1.0	1.3	.9	1.2
52	3.3	1.0	1.7	1.6	.7	1.4	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.7
53	3.5	.8	1.6	1.6	.7	1.4	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.6
54	3.2	.9	1.5	1.5	.7	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.2	1.6
55	2.9	.9	1.4	1.5	.6	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.2	1.6
56	3.0	.9	1.3	1.4	.1	.3	1.4	1.6	1.1	1.5
57	3.3	1.0	1.3	1.3	.3	.7	1.6	1.8	1.2	1.6
					Experimentation and Research					
1	2.2	1.4	.9	1.0	.6	.5	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.2
2	2.2	1.4	.8	.9	.6	.5	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.2
3	1.8	1.3	.7	.9	.4	.7	1.0	1.3	.9	1.2
4	2.1	1.5	.8	1.1	.4	.5	1.0	1.3	.9	1.2
5	1.7	1.3	.7	1.0	.6	.7	1.1	1.3	1.0	1.2
6	2.6	1.6	.9	1.1	.4	.7	1.1	1.4	.9	1.3
7	2.1	1.5	.7	1.1	.3	.5	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.2
8	2.0	1.3	.7	1.0	.3	.5	1.1	1.3	.9	1.2
9	2.3	1.4	.7	1.0	.1	.3	1.5	1.4	1.1	1.3
10	1.9	1.4	.8	1.1	.3	.5	1.2	1.6	1.0	1.2
11	2.3	1.5	.8	1.1	.4	.5	1.1	1.2	.9	1.1
12	1.8	1.5	.7	1.0	.3	.5	1.2	1.5	.9	1.4
13	2.0	1.5	.8	1.2	.3	.5	1.3	1.3	1.0	1.2
14	2.3	1.4	.8	1.1	1.0	.9	1.2	1.4	1.2	1.3
15	2.0	1.4	.7	1.0	.3	.5	1.3	1.4	1.0	1.3
16	1.8	1.4	.6	1.0	.3	.5	1.0	1.4	.8	1.2
17	2.0	1.4	.7	1.0	.1	.3	1.5	1.6	1.1	1.5
18	2.0	1.4	.8	1.1	.3	.4	1.4	1.4	1.1	1.3

MASTER DATA SHEET—CONTINUED

Competency*	Jury		100 Laboratory School Directors		Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Secondary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School	
	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
19	1.5	1.3	.7	1.1	.1	.3	1.6	1.3	.9	1.3
20	1.0	1.2	.7	1.0	.1	.3	1.1	1.4	.8	1.3
21	1.1	1.2	.7	1.0	.1	.3	1.0	1.4	.7	1.3
22	2.4	1.5	1.1	1.3	.4	.5	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.4
23	2.1	1.4	1.0	1.3	.6	.7	1.7	1.5	1.4	1.5
24	2.2	1.5	.8	1.2	.6	.5	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.3
25	2.3	1.5	1.1	1.3	.3	.4	1.4	1.5	1.1	1.4
26	2.1	1.6	.7	1.1	.3	.4	1.4	1.4	1.1	1.3
27	2.0	1.6	.8	1.2	.3	.4	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.2
28	1.9	1.6	.8	1.3	.3	.4	1.1	1.3	.9	1.2
29	2.5	1.5	.8	1.2	.3	.4	1.4	1.5	1.1	1.4
30	1.7	1.3	.6	.9	.1	.3	1.1	1.2	.9	1.2
31	1.9	1.5	.6	1.1	.1	.3	1.0	1.3	.8	1.2
32	1.9	1.4	.8	1.2	.3	.4	1.3	1.5	1.0	1.4
33	1.8	1.3	.6	1.0	.1	.3	.7	1.2	.5	1.0
34	2.0	1.5	.7	1.1	.1	.3	.7	1.2	.6	1.1
35	1.6	1.4	.6	1.0	.3	.5	.9	1.2	.7	1.1
36	1.7	1.5	.7	1.1	.9	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.0	1.3
37	2.0	1.7	.8	1.1	.9	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.4
38	2.1	1.7	.9	1.2	1.0	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.5
39	2.0	1.1	.8	1.1	.3	.5	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.4
40	2.3	1.5	.8	1.1	.4	.5	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.2
41	1.9	1.5	.8	1.1	.7	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.4
42	2.4	1.5	.9	1.2	.6	1.0	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.4
43	1.8	1.4	.9	1.2	.1	.3	1.3	1.5	1.0	1.3
44	1.2	1.2	.7	1.1	.1	.5	1.2	1.6	.9	1.4
45	1.9	1.5	.9	1.3	.3	.5	1.7	1.5	1.3	1.6
46	1.7	1.3	.7	1.2	.1	.3	1.3	1.5	1.0	1.4
47	2.2	1.6	.8	1.2	.6	1.0	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.3
48	1.8	1.4	.7	1.1	.1	.3	.9	1.2	.7	1.1
49	1.8	1.4	.7	1.1	.1	.3	1.0	1.3	.7	1.2

MASTER DATA SHEET—CONTINUED

Competency*	Jury		100 Laboratory School Directors		Elementary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Secondary Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School		Total Faculty of P. K. Yonge Laboratory School	
	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.	M.	S.D.
50	1.7	1.4	.6	1.1	.1	.3	1.2	1.4	.9	1.3
51	2.0	1.5	.6	1.0	.7	1.4	.9	1.2	.9	1.2
52	1.6	1.5	.8	1.3	.1	.3	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.5
53	1.7	1.5	.9	1.3	.1	.3	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.5
54	1.4	1.4	.8	1.2	.4	.7	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.6
55	1.4	1.4	.8	1.3	.4	.7	1.7	1.6	1.3	1.5
56	1.4	1.4	.8	1.2	.1	.3	1.4	1.5	1.0	1.4
57	2.2	1.6	.9	1.2	.1	.3	1.8	1.7	1.4	1.6

*Refers to competency of same number in Exhibit A.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Carey Thomas Southall, Jr. was born in Gainesville, Florida on September 21, 1921. He attended the public schools in Palatka, Florida, and the University of Florida.

He served during World War II with the United States Marine Corps in an enlisted status from 1943 to 1946. Upon being honorably discharged from military service, he resumed his studies at the University of Florida where he received the Bachelor of Science degree in Agricultural Education in 1948 and the degree of Master of Arts in Education in 1950.

He was a teacher of social studies at Gainesville High School from 1949 to 1951. In March 1951 he was recalled to active military duty and served as Educational Training Officer with the United States Air Force until his release in 1953.

Mr. Southall has been enrolled since 1953 in the Graduate School of the University of Florida pursuing advanced studies. He has served as a graduate assistant and is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, Kappa Delta Pi and is listed in Who's Who in American Education, 1951-52. His social fraternity is Alpha Gamma Rho. He is a member of the First Presbyterian Church of Gainesville.

Mr. Southall was married to Lola Jean Rose in 1948. They have one daughter, Carol Ann.

He has been employed as an Instructor in the School of Education at East Texas State Teachers College at Commerce, Texas.

THIS DISSERTATION WAS PREPARED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CANDIDATE'S SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE AND HAS BEEN APPROVED BY ALL MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. IT WAS SUBMITTED TO THE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL AND WAS APPROVED AS PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION.

AUGUST, 1955

J. N. B. White

DEAN, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Leonard Henderson

CHAIRMAN

Charles L. Dunmire

Hal H. Lewis

James L. Wattenbarger

W. E. Baringer